



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2016

No. 135

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 8, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### PAUSE AND REFLECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we approach the somber anniversary of the attacks of September 11, 2001, to honor the memory of the innocent people who perished on that terrible day and extend our continued prayers and sympathy to their loved ones.

For 15 years, I have stood at firehouses and schools, churches and veterans halls, and heard the stories of bravery and heroism from that morn-

ing that forever changed America. New Jersey lost more than 700 residents in the attacks, 81 of them from communities I represent here in Congress.

Each personal story is remarkable in its own way, offering a different memory or perspective on the events of September 11. In hearing stories from that day, Americans relive that morning, recalling where they were when they heard the news of the planes that struck the World Trade Center, the sickening realization that our Nation was under attack, and the tremendous heroism and self-sacrifice of so many in New York, at the Pentagon, and on a plane over Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Many of these stories are not new but need to be retold as a younger generation comes of age, that their neighbors—innocent people in their communities—were targeted in an act of war upon this Nation, and from such heinous acts came brave first responders, courageously initiating rescues, knowing their lives were in great danger, friends and coworkers helping each other to safety, and many young Americans who then answered a call to service to protect and defend the United States.

It is our duty to instill in the generations that follow respect and honor for the lives lost that terrible day and the lives lost in defense of our Nation in the years that have followed. It is our duty here in Congress to protect this Nation, to provide for the common defense, and vividly to recall the pain of a wounded Nation so that we be aware always of what it takes to keep this Nation safe and free.

The lives lost in the ensuing battles abroad have continued to try the foundation of our will. We have proven steadfast in the commitment to our values. Our freedom and liberty have been protected by brave men and women who selflessly answered the call of service by volunteering for military service.

No matter the challenges we face, we must remember that our Nation is truly blessed. I ask all Americans today to pause and reflect on the tragedy of September 11, 2001. Please pray for the victims and honor their memory. Please pay tribute to the men and women who serve and defend us today against the dangers we still face. May God bless them, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

### CROWN POINT, INDIANA, GUN SHOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, “Gun to the right, no gun to the left” was the greeting I heard as I entered the Industrial Arts Building in Crown Point, Indiana. On this particular sunny Sunday afternoon in July, the enormous building was playing host to the Central Indiana Gun and Knife Show.

The building, which sits on the Lake County Fairgrounds, plays host to garden shows, home improvement and craft vendors; but on this date, the 90-year-old brick building was featuring products that were of an altogether different nature.

As they enter the gun show, visitors carrying weapons had to demonstrate to security that their guns were not loaded, while those not carrying could enter without screening. I paid my \$5 entry and was asked if I resided in Indiana. Being an Illinois resident, I answered no and received a hand stamp depicting me as out of State.

At first glance, I saw kids hanging around vendors, munching on hot dogs. There were several hundred people in attendance by lunchtime, mostly White, middle-aged men, but a few women as well. Judging by the license plates in the parking lot, there were a healthy number of gun enthusiasts from my home State of Illinois in attendance.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5165

At most tables, you could hear the hagglers looking for a better deal or discussing options for their purchase. They would ask: Chrome-lined or stainless steel barrel? What about a free-float rail? The possibilities seemed endless, as people wandered among dozens of tables.

Sellers were offering everything from high-volume magazines and sophisticated scope systems to attachable bipods and customized stocks. Prices for assault weapons typically ranged from \$600 to \$2,500, including a bipod and two drum magazines, each capable of holding 100 rounds. One dealer explained that the wide variation in pricing depended on the bells and whistles and the markup.

Not every weapon was particularly pricey. One vendor, who seemed eager to reduce inventory, marked down one of his assault rifles to under \$400. There were tables upon tables of handguns for sale, as well as a folding single-shot, .22-caliber rifle, small enough to fit in a backpack, for under \$200. Still other vendors offered to help customize your purchase on the spot. You could choose from dozens of barrel lengths and styles to go with your choice in stocks and other components.

There was plenty of ammo to go with any weapon you might purchase. Depending on the caliber and ammunition type, prices started as low as \$10 for a box of 50. Boxes of ammunition with a similar number of rounds for many assault rifles cost as little as \$20. Another dealer offered high-capacity, 50-round magazines for a gun show special of one for \$20 or three for \$55.

There was a lot of gear aimed toward women as well, with pink, single-shot rifles, body armor tailored for women, and purses designed for concealed carry. Even local charities got on the scene, with an AR-15 being auctioned off to benefit the Marine Corps League. All you had to do to be included was buy a \$1 raffle ticket and give your first name and phone number.

It was a surreal atmosphere within the midst of recent tragedies. It made me wonder if those in attendance were either oblivious or all too aware of those heartbreaking headlines. The gun show returns this month to Crown Point, but given the number of deadly weapons already on the streets of my hometown of Chicago, I think I will wait for the next home improvement show before making a return trip.

#### KILLING THE INNOCENTS IN SYRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you a story. There was a little boy named Ali Daqneesh, age 10, and his little brother is Omran. That is the boy you see in the photo here that was shared across the Internet, worldwide, 2 weeks ago.

Ali was a really good big brother. He loved to play outside, and he was still

at that age when kids really get to dream big and imagine their future. I can only imagine the life that Ali looked forward to. Maybe he wanted to be a police officer; maybe he wanted to be a teacher or a doctor. I really can't say for certain because, tragically, his life was cut short by an airstrike.

Ali's death is an all-too-common fate for many of Syria's men, women, and children. These are the people who have lost their chance at life from the brutality of Bashar al-Assad and Vladimir Putin.

Of the over 500,000 dead Syrians, more than 50,000 are Syrian children who have been killed since the evil dictator Bashar al-Assad turned against his own people in 2011. Yet, even as the world continues to be outraged over these atrocities and pictures of dazed and bloody Syrian children like Ali's brother Omran, Assad and Russia and their Iranian backers are still barrel-bombing and launching chemical weapons against civilian targets.

On a daily basis, we hear that Syrian and Russian fighter planes have launched attacks on medical facilities and hospitals across the country. When these facilities are bombed, it is the children who suffer. In fact, the regime's belief is don't target, necessarily, military assets because, when you target innocent civilians, you inflict more collective pain on the population of Syria; and in Assad's estimation, that brings the war closer to an end.

At the end of July, a maternity hospital in Idlib was bombed. A recent story in *The New Yorker* highlighted the horror that comes with these bombings. In Aleppo, newborns in incubators suffocated to death because a Syrian or Russian airstrike cut off power to a hospital. Who is doing this? And why?

Bashar al-Assad continued the legacy of brutality against his people from his father—his father, who had one goal, and that was to keep power. Power is a crazy motivator for some people. The people of Syria, in 2011, decided they wanted some freedom, as is humanity's right, and they stood up and protested peacefully against Assad.

What did Assad do? Did he respond by saying: Well, let's talk and maybe find a way to have an outlet for your interests or your concerns? No. Assad rolled the tanks. Assad said he would kill his opposition. And what ensued after that was the incubation of a group we know today as ISIS, the opening of a civil war in Syria that is now spreading all over the Middle East, a massive refugee crisis around the world.

I hear some people in political conversations today express admiration for Vladimir Putin. They express admiration for Vladimir Putin's strength, as if oppressing and killing people is something to be proud of. That doesn't show strength. That shows weakness.

Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin and Russia are tearing Europe apart. Vladimir Putin and Russia are delivering

bombs on medical facilities and on children in Syria. They are no ally of ours. Sometimes the enemy of our enemy is still our enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I hear people sometimes say that dictatorships work in the Middle East. Sometimes they say that this introduction of freedom has somehow been terrible for people who just aren't ready for it. I agree. The introduction of freedom to a society that is not used to it can sometimes be very messy, and sometimes in the course of looking back over 20 years of history we see the success. That happened in our own founding. We went through the Civil War. We went through a bloody Revolution. We went through a time where we kept an entire race in chains. But, Mr. Speaker, when people say that dictatorships work, no, they don't.

This kid, I always wonder what is going through his mind. Probably not much because he was stunned at the bomb that landed on his house and killed his brother.

□ 1015

#### FUND THE ZIKA EMERGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we often hear from constituents who are frustrated by Congress' failure to act on many of the most pressing issues facing our country.

Seven weeks ago, as if we were determined to confirm this indictment, Congress adjourned for summer recess with a long list of critical unfinished business. We came nowhere near finishing our appropriations bills, leaving open the question of whether we can even keep the government open past September 30. We failed to pass the most rudimentary gun violence measures, leaving the tragedies of San Bernardino and Orlando unaddressed.

And then there was Zika, perhaps the most incredible failure of all. With an epidemic bearing down on us—an epidemic with disastrous human consequences, but with a prescribed course of action that could do much to prevent and mitigate the catastrophe—still, Congress refused to act.

Now we are back in session, facing daily headlines about the dangers posed by Zika. The number of Zika travel-related cases in the continental U.S. is increasing, the number of pregnant women infected is growing, and the number of babies being born—or worse, lost—with microcephaly or other Zika-related complications is rising. Increasing numbers of mosquito-borne cases have been reported in Puerto Rico and south Florida. I learned this week that five service members and retirees from Fort Bragg in North Carolina are being treated for Zika.

It has been more than 6 months since the President requested an emergency supplemental appropriation of \$1.9 billion from Congress to fund Zika preparedness, response, and prevention, as

well as critical research. The request was carefully and comprehensively documented and justified.

In the meantime, our local, State, and Federal public health agencies and authorities have continued to shift funds and reorder priorities in an attempt to get a handle on this public health emergency. Indeed, our own universities and other research centers have been shifting money around for months, as I learned at a conference I helped organize in North Carolina on June 7.

Researchers testified there as to the great promise of the work they are doing, but also as to the great efforts they have been required to make, in the face of inadequate and uncertain funding, to ensure that the work continues. I left that conference impressed and encouraged by the work that was going on. But I also left chagrined and angered at the way Congress, under Republican leadership, with no serious attempt at bipartisan cooperation, is letting these dedicated researchers and the entire country down.

The House and Senate Republican conference report contains only \$1.1 billion of the requested funds, but the larger problem is that it robs other critical public health priorities—notably, Ebola, but also disaster preparedness—in order to satisfy Republican budget ideologues.

Adding insult to injury, the Republican conference report also includes several misguided and dangerous policy riders. These poison pills would severely limit access to contraceptives in Puerto Rico, where thousands of cases of Zika have been recorded. It would take yet another shot at Planned Parenthood and would roll back certain clean water regulations, ostensibly to allow for the increased spraying of pesticides.

I recently met with Director Anthony S. Fauci of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, who explained the incredible lengths to which NIH and CDC have gone in order to protect the health of the American people. They have desperately cobbled together a budget, most recently taking money even from vital research into cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, and other diseases. Despite such extraordinary efforts, the CDC and NIH will run out of money after October 1.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we honor the President's request of \$1.9 billion in a bill free of destructive offsets and ideological riders. It is crucial that Congress take action for the pregnant women in their first trimesters who are scared to leave their homes; for the children born with a range of disabilities, of which microcephaly is only the worst; for the service men and women stationed across the globe who are at particular risk; and for the 25 percent of Puerto Rico's population who will potentially contract this disease.

We can and we must as a country do better than this. Let's do the right

thing for our constituents, our country, and for the rest of the world by finally funding this public health emergency. We have long since run out of excuses. We can wait no longer.

#### OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S WAR ON POLICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, never has an American President been so willing to shoot first and ask questions later when a police officer uses deadly force in self-defense or to protect innocent lives. Never in American history has a President's legacy been a consistent disregard for the rule of law.

Time after time, after police shootings of African Americans, the Obama administration's knee-jerk, racially divisive strategy has been to paint a disturbingly false image of racial bias in police shootings that conflicts with a recent 2016 Harvard University study that found that police are 24 percent less likely to fire upon African Americans than Caucasian Americans.

For emphasis, let me repeat that. A 2016 Harvard University study by African American Professor Roland Fryer, Jr., found that police fire upon African Americans 24 percent less often than police fire upon Caucasian Americans.

On July 7, well before the facts of two police shootings of African Americans were known, President Obama, again, stoked racial prejudice flames by claiming that "Black folks are more vulnerable to these kinds of incidents." President Obama even defended subsequent, sometimes violent, protests as rather benign "expressions of outrage."

Shortly after the Obama administration attacked the motives of America's law enforcement officers and, perhaps, helped inspire even more violence against police, a Dallas sniper gunned down five police officers and injured many others during a Black Lives Matter protest. The shooter justified his murders by stating he was upset by police shootings, referenced Black Lives Matter, and stated that he wanted to kill White people, especially White police officers.

Three days later, after these horrific murders of police officers, President Obama reiterated his politically motivated, racial division narrative by blaming the attacks, in part, on a racial prejudice problem that police must fix because "that is what's going to ultimately help make the job of being a cop a lot safer."

Showing great hutzpah at the Dallas memorial ceremony for the slain officers, Obama, again, publicly blamed police racial bias as a contributing cause of police assassinations.

Mr. Speaker, when tearful Americans seek solace and unification, the Obama administration dishes out racism and antipolice profiling that helps inspire even more violence against police.

The result of the Obama administration's politics of racial division and hatred?

So far this year, as of September 2, firearms-related deaths of American law enforcement officers are up 56 percent.

The Obama administration's relationship with police has deteriorated so badly that William Johnson, the executive director of the National Association of Police Organizations, accuses Barack Obama of engaging in a "war on police," adding that the Obama administration's "continued appeasements at the Federal level with the Department of Justice, their appeasement of violent criminals, their refusal to condemn movements like Black Lives Matter actively calling for the death of police officers, that type of thing, all the while blaming police for the problems in this country, has led directly to the climate that has made Dallas possible."

Mr. Speaker, no one condones illegal shootings by police. Police who illegally use excessive force should be, and are, prosecuted criminally and civilly to the fullest extent of the law. But the Obama administration repeatedly pours gasoline on an open fire, rushing to antipolice judgment before the facts are known, and justice had, thereby helping to incite murders and assassinations of American police who dedicate their lives to our protection.

The solution, Mr. Speaker, is generating more respect for law and order and those who enforce it. That solution is absent in Obama administration pronouncements.

Mr. Speaker, I want the public to know that I stand with the rule of law. I stand with America's brave police officers who protect the rights and lives of all Americans. And I here and now publicly thank America's law enforcement officers for risking their lives to protect law-abiding Americans from crime and anarchy.

#### STUDENT LOAN DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, when I traveled around northwest Oregon last month, from town hall meetings to the grocery store, I spoke with Oregonians about the challenges they are facing and what keeps them up at night. Time after time, the conversation turned to the cost of higher education.

It is likely we have all spoken with parents trying to make ends meet who can't save for their young children's education and recent graduates who are worried about finding jobs that will cover their looming student loan payments. But we also hear from too many people who are trying to balance their current student loan debt with child care, housing, and other expenses. Many are getting by, but 1 month of unexpected unemployment or illness

could set them back years. Unfortunately, for too many, the threat of default is already a reality.

Currently, more than 8 million student loan borrowers are in default on their educational debt, and the number is growing. These are hardworking Americans—mothers, fathers, veterans, nurses, teachers, and young people—who are trying to improve their lives, but have been pulled into financial turmoil.

The 8 million people in default—a group, roughly, twice the size of Oregon—are at risk of financial ruin. Their tax refunds and Social Security benefits may be withheld. Their wages can be garnished and they can face legal action. And with damaged credit, borrowing for a home, car, or business, or even renting an apartment can be an impossible task.

What can Congress do for those who are struggling to make their student loan payments?

The answer is SIMPLE.

Today I am pleased to introduce legislation with my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman RYAN COSTELLO. Our bill, the Streamlining Income-Driven Manageable Payments on Loans for Education, or SIMPLE Act, makes it easier for millions of at-risk student loan borrowers to access protections that are already available under the law.

Income-driven repayment plans allow borrowers to make loan payments that are based on how much they earn. So, in other words, what they can afford. As a result, they are much less likely than other borrowers to default on their debt. That is good for the borrower, their families, and local economies.

Unfortunately, too many at-risk borrowers don't know about these plans or they are unable to navigate the complicated application for enrolling, so they don't receive the benefit of lower payments. In fact, 70 percent of borrowers in default from the government's largest student loan program, the Direct Loan program, would have qualified for lower payments.

Even if borrowers enroll in income-driven repayment, they must complete a burdensome process to update information. In one study, more than half of the borrowers did not recertify their income on time. When this happens, a borrower's payments can spike and suddenly push the borrower toward delinquency and default.

In short, the government makes it unnecessarily difficult for people who are weighed down by student debt to get the help the law already affords them.

Our bipartisan SIMPLE Act streamlines the process and removes barriers that prevent borrowers from benefiting from income-driven repayment. The bill uses borrowers' existing income data to automatically provide at-risk borrowers on the verge of default with lower loan payments. The bill provides for automatic updates of borrowers' in-

come information each year, so they continue to pay what they can afford.

As college costs continue to rise and more students leave school with increasing levels of debt, it is clear that this House needs to act to make higher education more affordable for everyone. The SIMPLE Act is part of that broader effort. It works by reaching at-risk borrowers, simplifying the process to get them into a plan with repayment based on income and helping them keep their payments affordable and avoid default.

I thank Mr. COSTELLO for his partnership on this bill and urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation.

□ 1030

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DALLAS KNOX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and legacy of an American patriot, a patriot who served his country with honor and distinction before passing away last month in a boating accident at only 35 years old.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Warrant Officer Dallas Knox of Treasure Island, Florida. Chief Knox faithfully served his country as a Black Hawk Medevac helicopter pilot in the U.S. Army and the Army Reserve. Chief Knox had multiple deployments, including tours in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Kosovo. Chief Knox also served as a Black Hawk instructor pilot.

Having attended his memorial service, his colleagues each spoke that Dallas was one of the most gifted pilots they ever served with, a man of bravery, valor, always thoughtful, and always giving to others.

The medals Knox earned for his service speak volumes about his dedication and his commitment to the country he so loved. Knox was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, among so many other awards.

Described by his family as selfless, compassionate, loving, and full of life, Chief Knox is survived by his mother, Carol, his father, Richard, sister, Kirsten, as well as loving nieces and nephews.

May God bless Chief Warrant Officer Dallas Knox, his family, and his friends; and may God bless the country Chief Knox so proudly fought for, the United States of America.

#### DISAPPOINTED BUT NOT DEFEATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, I stood in this very spot to express my disappointment that my Republican colleagues and leadership showed both cowardice and callousness by failing to call up a single commonsense gun violence prevention measure before leaving town for 53 days.

I rise today not just disappointed. Instead, I am ashamed; I am appalled. Republicans adjourned for a historic 7-week recess from D.C. without fulfilling their duty to the American people, and, once again, our most vulnerable communities paid the price.

I am disappointed, but I am not defeated. So I rise today to remind my colleagues of what 7 weeks of Republican inaction looks like.

In my district in Chicago, gun violence claimed the lives of 90 people and injured 375 more in August alone. This Labor Day weekend, Chicago passed 500 homicides for the year, the first time we have crossed this threshold in two decades.

Outside of my district, 7 weeks of congressional inaction meant that more than 4,100 families lost a loved one to gun violence. In 2016, gun violence has taken the lives of almost 10,000 and wounded more than 20,000; 10,000 people killed by guns in less than 9 months—10,000.

When will this number be high enough for us to take action? Who has to die for us to have the courage to pass commonsense gun legislation? Why does Democrats sitting in protest outrage Republicans, but 10,000 deaths merits no response?

We have heard the majority threaten to admonish Democrats for speaking the truth, but 10,000 lives lost to guns gets nothing—no votes, and 7 weeks of inaction.

In this D.C. bubble, it is easy to forget that 10,000 isn't just a number. They are 10,000 mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters. Behind each gun death is a family who once celebrated a life, but now mourns the loss of a loved one.

Behind each gun death, there is a fearful mother now too afraid to let her children play outside. Behind each gun death, another small-business owner debates closing up shop for good.

While it is no secret that gun violence affects all communities across our Nation, it is our most underserved neighborhoods that are the most devastated. Congressional inaction allows the most vulnerable in our Nation to continue to suffer.

So I urge my colleagues, let's use this time in September wisely. Let's work together and pass legislation that will reduce gun violence in our communities.

I am not just talking about a need to pass commonsense measures that keeps guns out of the hands of those seeking to do harm. I am talking about a comprehensive approach that addresses the root causes of this gun violence epidemic.

Too often we boil down this complex problem to talking points about comprehensive background checks, closing

loopholes, and improving mental health services when, in reality, it is also about economic opportunity, building trust between the community and law enforcement, as well as passing these commonsense gun violence prevention measures.

In April, I launched the Urban Progress, or UP, Initiative to address these root causes of gun violence. UP partners with local community leaders, activists, business leaders, and elected officials to promote economic opportunity, improve community policing, and build on commonsense gun violence prevention strategies.

With the input from the UP Initiative partners and many of my colleagues here in the House, I introduced the Urban Progress Act, a bill that would ensure that the Federal Government remains committed to reducing the gun violence ravaging our communities.

My bill would reinvest in our economically underserved communities, take steps to restore the vital trust between law enforcement officers and the community, and would keep guns out of the hands of those seeking to do harm.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk about these issues in my bill. Let's debate them. Let's vote on them. I urge my colleagues to listen to the American people.

Lastly, I am outraged that anyone would accuse the President of starting any type of racial issue. The President has spoken about gun violence prevention and preventing cops from getting killed and preventing innocent people from getting killed also, so I am outraged to hear these statements.

#### SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since September 1, the first day of National Suicide Prevention Month, 944 Americans have died by suicide, including 160 veterans.

Since the passage of H.R. 2646, the mental health reform act, in the House of Representatives in July, 7,552 Americans have died from suicide, including 1,280 veterans.

I had the honor of meeting the parents of Sergeant Daniel Somers, who served bravely in Operation Iraqi Freedom. On June 13, 2013, Daniel took his own life after suffering from PTSD and traumatic brain injury. His family is heartbroken.

He left a letter for his family before he took his own life, and I would like to share his words. He wrote:

I am sorry that it has come to this. The fact is, for as long as I can remember, my motivation for getting up every day has been so that you would not have to bury me. As things have continued to get worse, it has become clear that this alone is not a sufficient reason to carry on.

The fact is I am not getting better, I am not going to get any better, and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on. From a logical standpoint, it is better to simply end things quickly and let any repercussions from that play out in the short term than to drag things out into the long term.

I really have been trying to hang on for more than a decade now. Each day has been a testament to the extent to which I cared, suffering unspeakable horror as quietly as possible so that you could feel as though I was still here for you. In truth, I was nothing more than a prop, filling space so that my absence would not be noted. In truth, I have already been absent for a long, long time.

My body has become nothing but a cage, a source of pain and constant problems . . . It is nothing short of torture. My mind is a wasteland, filled with visions of incredible horror, unceasing depression, and crippling anxiety.

Is it any wonder then that the latest figures show 22 veterans killing themselves each day? That is more veterans than children who were killed at Sandy Hook every single day. Where are the huge policy initiatives?

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a letter that did not have to be written. I can't even imagine the grief of the parents of Daniel, but I also know that they want to spare other parents the same kind of grief.

I continue to practice psychology at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda. I work with veterans who, like Daniel, suffer from depression and PTSD and traumatic brain injury. I have seen firsthand that, with treatment, these soldiers can and do get better.

When our brave men and women come home, they and their families deserve better care. Yet we do not have enough crisis psychiatric hospital beds. Half the counties in America have no psychiatrists or no psychologists. And for every 1,000 people with an addiction disorder, only 6—only 6—get evidence-based care, and families are blocked from helping by a massive bureaucracy.

So we can read more sad letters like Daniel's, or we can act. The House answered that call on July 6, 2016, when we passed, by a near-unanimous vote, H.R. 2646, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. But it only works and it only gives help if it is signed into law.

I don't want any more moments of silence for Daniel or the thousands of other veterans or citizens who have died by suicide. We don't need more moments of silence. We need times of action. Those moments of silence are a slap in the face to the mothers and fathers who struggle to get help for their sons and daughters.

So I ask: How can the Senate even contemplate the talk of going home before this is passed with this death toll climbing, even when they have the solution in their hands?

Indecision and politics are overruling compassion and common sense. What about veterans like Daniel, for whom help never came?

On behalf of those silenced voices, I call upon the Senate to take action and

pass H.R. 2646 before they go home at the end of September. We must have treatment before tragedy. We must provide mental health support. After all, 90 percent of suicide deaths have a co-occurring mental illness. Otherwise, what will we tell those family members who find the next suicide note, that when there was a chance to act, Congress went home?

These veterans will never go home. These thousands of other people who commit suicide, nonveterans, will never go home again, and the Senate should not go home again in September without passing H.R. 2646.

Remember, where there is help, there is hope.

#### NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to follow my good friend, Dr. MURPHY, on the floor. I appreciate his tireless efforts in terms of mental health and of suicide prevention. I was pleased this week to introduce with him legislation to recognize September as National Suicide Prevention Month.

We have this ritual of designating certain days, weeks, and months in honor of issues that can be momentous and sometimes arcane, but this one is existential.

We are looking at a time of great division not just in Congress but in American society. Suicide prevention ought to be a great unifier. We lose five lives every hour to a cause that is usually treatable and often preventable. The nature of the suicide epidemic, which has been increasing every year for the last decade, has the power to unite and bring people together to make a difference.

I applaud him for his work on the mental health legislation. I hope that we are all encouraged and emboldened, particularly as relates to our veterans, and his work there is commendable.

We are losing a veteran almost every hour to suicide. It is also the second leading cause of death among young people ages 10 to 34, yet people who commit suicide almost always show symptoms that could be diagnosed and treated.

In addition to the tragic disruption on individuals and families, it is estimated that suicide results in \$44 billion in combined economic and work costs. It is a national crisis and a tragedy that has touched almost every family I know.

The area of suicide prevention is one of shared passions that can contribute to solutions. For mental health professionals, it is rich with possibilities. If you are concerned about gun violence, this is an area of opportunity. Those who attempt suicide with a firearm are successful about 85 percent of the time.

Drug and alcohol abuse is a factor in many cases. Due to the underlying substance abuse or issues, individual actions can be clouded by the influence of drug or alcohol when suicide is attempted.

There is a role for each and every one of us to play as advocates, as individuals, for treatment and suicide prevention counseling, recovery, and to support the grief of the family members left behind.

I am excited about the network of organizations across the country, often with major volunteer input, who are making a difference. I visited one recently in my community, Lines for Life, that has volunteers manning 24-hour phone lines to help people in a time of crisis.

□ 1045

It is overseen by licensed clinicians. This one volunteer-driven organization handles nearly 55,000 calls per year, offering immediate assistance to people who want to overcome substance abuse, prevent suicide, and find treatment for happier, more productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we will, in fact, designate September as Suicide Prevention Month, but that every month will be Suicide Prevention Month and that we will all rededicate ourselves to combating this epidemic that touches lives in every one of our communities.

#### THE SIMPLE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Streamlining Income-Driven, Manageable Payments on Loans for Education Act or, more simply, the SIMPLE Act.

I first want to thank Congresswoman SUZANNE BONAMICI for her leadership and hard work on this bill, which I am proud to introduce with her today.

Education is an area where we should be focused on bipartisan solutions because every Pennsylvanian—indeed, every American—deserves the opportunity to succeed, and that path to success starts with an education.

Many of my constituents have expressed concerns about the cost of a college education, including making payments on their student loans after they graduate. The challenge of how to responsibly manage student debt makes this bill so important.

The SIMPLE Act would assist millions of Americans who carry student loan debt. For many young people, student loan debt is the first type of debt they incur, but it can leave them unable to invest in their future, despite being employed and working hard.

Consider that borrowers who miss payments may face lifelong ramifications that make it more expensive and, in some cases, prohibitive to rent an apartment or purchase a home or a car.

Our bill would assist borrowers on the verge of default by notifying them of more affordable repayment plans. “The SIMPLE Act establishes processes to automatically enroll severely delinquent borrowers in income-driven repayment plans with low monthly payments. The legislation also automates the annual process for updating income information while enrolled in these plans, ensuring that borrowers continue to make affordable payments.”

“This measure uses the information borrowers already have on file at the Internal Revenue Service to eliminate the obstacles to enrolling in an affordable repayment plan and lets borrowers benefit from lower monthly payments.” But even those enrolled in affordable repayment plans face the paperwork hassle of a complicated process of having to annually recertify their income to keep their low payment. Failure to promptly recertify can, as I mentioned, result in substantial economic detriment. That is, again, why our legislation will responsibly relieve some of that burden by automatically updating a borrower's income.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It will assist borrowers in getting back on track and, in turn, reduce the negative impact of a missed loan payment.

#### RECOGNIZING 95 YEARS OF EXEMPLARY SERVICE OF THE LIMERICK FIRE COMPANY

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize 95 years of exemplary service to the 14,000 residents of Limerick Township, Montgomery County, by the Limerick Township Fire Company.

Organized in 1921 and chartered in 1927, its now 250 members and 35 active firefighters are doing a tremendous job in keeping Limerick Township safe, dedicating thousands of hours every year.

I want to thank the company president, Tom Walters, and all the members of the Limerick Township Fire Department for the great work that they do. I wish them the very best for the next 95 years of service to the Limerick Township Fire Company and beyond.

#### JULY'S VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the minority has for many months now begged and pleaded to have a bill come to this floor for a vote on gun violence prevention. We have even had a sit-in. But all that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to do is have moments of silence and then be silent.

The only moments of silence are for those names that are in the headlines. That is not good enough. All of the deaths matter, and all of the deaths from mass shootings in the month of July deserve to be recognized by all of us.

So as I have done each month since the beginning of this year, I will now read the names of all those who were killed in mass shootings in the month of July:

Alex Freeman, 28, and Marcus Cal, also 28, were killed on July 4 in Chattanooga.

Armando Cardona, 45, and Naome Innis, 35, were killed on July 4 in Phoenix.

Charles Jackson, 28, Jamal Dataunte Dixon-Lackey, 26, and Daquarius Tucker, 19, were killed at a Fourth of July block party in Houston, Texas. Daquarius' brother was also shot and killed this summer. Police said both brothers were innocent bystanders.

Demetrius Grant, 39, was killed at a party on July 5 in LA.

Jeffrey Adams, 52, was killed by his neighbor on July 5 in Hiram, Georgia.

Jennifer Rooney, 44, was killed by a mass shooter while driving on July 7 in Bristol, Tennessee.

Five Dallas police officers—Brent Thompson, Patrick Zamarripa, Michael Krol, Michael Smith, and Lorne Aherns—were killed in the line of duty on July 7 in Dallas, Texas.

Domingo Rodriguez Rhines, 40, was killed in Shreveport, Louisiana.

Joseph Zangaro, 61, and Ron Kienzie, 60, both court bailiffs, were killed by an escaping suspect on July 11 in St. Joseph, Michigan.

Jacara Sproaps, 38, and Maurice Partlow, 40, were killed by Jacara's ex-boyfriend on July 13 in St. Louis, Missouri. Jacara was an elementary school principal beloved by the community.

Eric Gaiter, 22, was killed July 14 in Akron, Ohio, while at a vigil for another gun violence victim.

Three unidentified people were killed at a home in Crosby, Texas.

Joseph Lamar, 38, Janell Renee Knight, 43, and Zachary David Thompson, 36, were killed by their friend on July 15 in Woodland, Washington.

Miguel Bravo, 21, was killed when gunmen open-fired on the house party next door on July 16 in Bakersfield, California.

Three police officers, Montrell Jackson, 32, Matthew Gerald, 41, and Brad Garafola, 45, were killed in the line of duty on July 17 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Edward James Long, 49, was killed on July 17 in Houston, Texas, while standing outside a Walgreens.

Bobbie Odneal, III, 23, and Rickey McGowan, 25, were killed on July 23 at a nightclub in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Erica Rodriguez, 21, her 3-year-old son, and Paula Nino, 20, were killed by Erica's boyfriend on July 23 in Bastrop, Texas.

Kalif Goens, 22, was killed by his brother on July 24 in a bar in Hamilton, Ohio.

Sean Archilles, 14, and Stef'An Strawder, 18, were killed outside an under-18 club on July 25 in Fort Myers, Florida.

Denzel Childs, 25, and Kayana Armond, 34, were killed on July 28 at a



block party in Chicago, Illinois. Jessica Williams, 16, witnessed the shooting and suffered an asthma attack that killed her.

Davon Harper, 23, was killed on July 28 in Baltimore, Maryland.

Anna Bui, Jake Long, and Jordan Ebner, all 19, were killed on July 30 in Washington when Anna's ex-boyfriend showed up at the house party with an AR-15.

Carole Comer, 71; her son, John Comer, 50; and her daughter, Rebecca Kelleher, 45, were killed by their husband and father on July 30 in Bridge-ton, Missouri.

Takeeya Fulton, 39, and her children, Nuckeria and Corey, were killed by Takeeya's boyfriend on July 31 in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

A few words about my constituent, Teqnika Moultrie, 30, who was killed on July 31 in Austin, Texas.

She was from San Carlos and worked as a school bus driver for Sequoia Union High School District. She was visiting with her wife's family in Austin when a gunman opened fire as she exited a doughnut shop. She died in her wife's arms. They had only been married for 3 months. After her death, her wife said: We just wanted to live a normal life, an everyday life and raise a family, be good moms and do it together. Now we don't get to do anything.

So many of these people killed at parties, on the sidewalks, and in their homes by people who were supposed to love them don't get to do any of that.

Mr. Speaker, deaths matter. All deaths matter.

#### ZIKA FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore Congress to take action to fund Zika response efforts in South Florida, throughout the country, and all over the world. Seven months have passed since the administration made its initial request for \$1.9 billion to combat Zika, a request I supported.

As of September 7, the State of Florida alone has seen 596 travel-related cases and 80 Zika infections involving pregnant women. Across the United States, thousands more have been infected with the virus.

Mr. Speaker, Florida has been ground zero for Zika, and we are seeing firsthand the devastating impacts it has not only on public health but on our economy as well.

Neighborhoods in Wynwood and Miami Beach and other communities across Florida are seeing decreased tourist traffic, and some residents, especially pregnant women, are fearful to venture outdoors. My wife and I know pregnant women who have moved away from South Florida to protect themselves and their unborn babies from a potential Zika infection.

Over the months of July and August, I met with the director of the Centers for Disease Control, Dr. Tom Frieden, as well as other government officials, including Senator RUBIO, Governor Scott, and my Florida colleagues from both parties to discuss the progress of the government's response and the importance of funding these efforts long-term.

It is imperative that Congress act on Zika legislation as soon as possible to provide the CDC and other agencies at the national, State, and local levels the tools they need to rid our neighborhoods of this disease. Combating Zika is not a Republican or Democrat initiative. It should be a national priority.

The mosquitoes carrying this disease will not discriminate between congressional lines or infect people from only certain States. All Members of Congress from both parties and across the country must appreciate the severity of inaction on passing Zika funding legislation. Let's put politics aside and get this done for our communities and for all Americans.

#### CONDEMNING AL-ASSAD'S BRUTALITY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise again to strongly condemn Bashar al-Assad's atrocities against the Syrian people. It has been reported that the government has, once again, unleashed barrel bombs with chlorine gas in Aleppo as the regime continues its brutal siege of that city. Victims of the attack suffered from breathing difficulties similar to the symptoms we have seen in the past when the government ignored international law by assaulting innocent people with chemical weapons.

This was the second recent chlorine attack that affected Syrians who have been cut off from aid and are unable to escape. In spite of repeated warnings, the Syrian Government continues to utilize barrel bombs filled with chemical weapons as a tool to remain in power.

This continued disregard for human life and the well-being of Syrians underscores why Assad must go and not be allowed to take part in the political transition discussions or Syria's future. The death and destruction in Syria is one of the greatest blemishes on human history. The entire world must do more to put an end to it.

#### BACK TO SCHOOL

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the end of the summer marks the beginning of the school year and a fresh start for teachers, students, and families. As a father of two young students and as a former school board member from Miami-Dade County Public Schools and now the husband of a teacher, I greatly cherish this time of year and the excitement that children feel while preparing to enter the next grade.

Soon after classes started, I visited Redland Middle, a school in my district that has greatly benefited from my amendment to provide students learning English an extra year to become

proficient before test scores count against their teachers and schools. Like all students, English language learners must be counted without being counted out, and their teachers deserve our support.

As a proud member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, ensuring young people the brightest future possible is a central focus of my work in Congress. I wish the students, parents, teachers, support staff, and families of Miami-Dade and the Florida Keys much success as this new school year gets underway.

□ 1100

#### HONORING MS. TANGELA SEARS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Tangela Sears, a local activist who has spent decades serving the south Florida community. She has been an outspoken leader on many topics, including gun violence and the need to protect young people in our community from these senseless crimes. She is a confident leader who stands up for her beliefs, and a fearless advocate who works to make south Florida a safer place to live.

A year ago, Tangela's son, David, died at the hands of gun violence, a tragedy she had worked her entire life to prevent. Though heartbroken, she used the memory of David as an opportunity to continue spreading the message of nonviolence and justice more than ever before.

I thank Ms. Sears for her years of service, advocacy, passion, and strength to make our community a better place for all, especially those who live in neighborhoods that have seen a troubling spike in violent crimes. We are extremely grateful for your unrelenting dedication to our community, and I know that David is extremely proud of you.

#### DEMANDING ACTION ON FLINT, MICHIGAN, AND THE ZIKA VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues who are demanding action for the families in Flint, Michigan. First, I want to acknowledge many Members of the Michigan delegation, led by Flint's Representative, Congressman DAN KILDEE, who are fighting every day to bring justice to these families. Their work is essential to ensuring the people of Flint have the resources that they need to recover.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in Flint is nothing short of a tragedy, and a tragedy that could have been prevented. Michigan State officials sacrificed the health and futures of Flint's children in order to save a few dollars in water costs. This really is a shame and a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, would this have happened in a city where the residents had the advantage of wealth? Or do these gross breaches of public trust only happen in cities where politicians believe the residents are expendable?

Sadly, I think we all know the answer to that question. After the incredible harm that has already been done to these families, our elected officials are, once again, turning their backs on the people of Flint. These families deserve better.

The people of Flint were already hurting before the water crisis. The average family income in the city is just \$24,834 a year. No one can raise a family on that. Many of these courageous and resilient families struggle to find high-quality child care, access healthcare services, and afford healthy food. And now the costs of this crisis are mounting for families, the schools, and the entire community. We can, and we must, do more for our fellow Americans in their time of need.

Two years since this tragedy began, families are still relying on bottled water for daily life. Imagine using bottled water for everything from brushing your teeth to making a bottle for a hungry baby.

We can do better by these families. They need support, including health care, nutrition, specialized education, and developmental care. And we need to fix the root of the problem: the degraded, dangerous pipes, and infrastructure that caused this tragedy.

The shortsighted, dangerous actions of Michigan officials have already caused unimaginable pain for these families. We cannot allow Congress to betray these families as well.

Let me just say that I was part of a congressional delegation that traveled to Flint, Michigan, to listen to the residents regarding the horrendous impact of these government decisions that led to the poisoning of those children and families. The environmental injustice in Flint is an example of how many low-income communities of color throughout our country, not just in Flint, throughout the United States, an example of how they are treated differently than affluent communities.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman DAN KILDEE and members of the Michigan delegation have introduced legislation that would help these families rebuild their lives and get the care they need for their children. The Families of Flint Act, H.R. 4479, is a comprehensive plan to address their most urgent needs. It would provide for critical investment in Flint's water system to replace the lead pipes that poisoned these families.

This legislation would also provide essential support services to the families of Flint to help these children mitigate and overcome lead exposure.

These are simple, commonsense measures for the people of Flint. Addressing this tragedy really shouldn't be a partisan issue. Every Member of this Chamber should understand the

need for urgent action. It could happen in any of our communities. Yet, congressional Republicans have not held one single vote, or even a hearing, on this bill. That is just simply outrageous.

And let me just say that Flint is not the only public health crisis that congressional Republicans have ignored. There are 17,000 Americans—including almost 1,600 pregnant women—who have contracted the Zika virus. The President submitted an emergency request of \$1.9 billion for Zika funding more than 6 months ago, and the Republicans have failed to act on it. Now, if we don't act soon, the CDC will be out of money to combat Zika in a matter of weeks.

Congressional Republicans also failed to do their job on gun violence. Every day, more than 90 million people die from gun violence. This, too, is a public health crisis; but congressional Republicans, once again, have refused to take up any commonsense gun legislation, even though 91 percent of Americans support background checks to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists and criminals.

It is clear that the American people need Congress to do its job. The women in Florida who can't leave their homes for fear of a mosquito bite need Congress to do its job. The families who fear gun violence on their block need Congress to do its job.

#### CALLING FOR ACTION ON PUBLIC HEALTH CRISES FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, House Republicans streamed out of the Capitol as I stood on this floor with my Democratic colleagues calling for action on the public health crises facing our country: gun violence, Zika, and Flint, Michigan's, poisoned water.

It is now nearly 8 weeks later. Congress has returned from the longest summer recess in more than 60 years, but we still have seen no action from the Republican majority on our Nation's most urgent crises.

Meanwhile, we are in the midst of a Zika outbreak. Puerto Rico is on track to see 25 of its population infected. Florida has locally transmitted Zika cases, and it is only a matter of time until we see cases in other States. Actually, we have seen some in other States. Parents who should be looking forward to the birth of a child are terrified that the baby may be born with devastating lifelong health problems.

Yet, Republicans refuse to provide the funding we need to combat this outbreak. Instead of passing a bill with sufficient funding, Republicans insist on making sure, believe it or not, that the Confederate flag can fly at VA cemeteries and on preventing family

planning clinics from helping patients with Zika.

That is right. Even though Zika has the greatest impact on women who are, or could become, pregnant, Republicans want to add a rider to stop the family planning clinics that serve women from responding to Zika.

Today, family planning clinics, like Planned Parenthood, are already on the front lines in fighting against Zika. In addition to providing family planning services, Planned Parenthood volunteers are visiting 25,000 households in Florida to find people of reproductive age, especially young women, who have likely not been reached by State or Federal Zika education efforts. They are providing Zika kits for pregnant women, containing items like insect repellent and standing water treatment.

Family planning clinics are an important part of our response to Zika. But instead of recognizing that fact, Republicans have doubled down on their extreme views on women's health.

Dr. Anthony Fauci, the head of the Infectious Disease Institute at the National Institutes of Health, has said in no uncertain terms that if we do not pass additional Zika funding, we will have to stop our efforts to develop a vaccine. Already, Federal agencies have had to borrow money from other critical health priorities to address the Zika problem. We have allowed money to be taken—or the Republicans have—from Ebola, cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. We can't keep fighting back by cutting back our fight against these other diseases.

Republican's refusal to pass Zika funding will have serious, deadly consequences for years to come. Americans can't wait any longer.

At the same time, the people of Flint are still waiting for congressional assistance after the tragic lead poisoning crisis in that city. I joined 25 of my Democratic colleagues in Flint earlier this year. We heard from nearly 200 community members, including parents, worried about their children's future. After that trip, we said we wouldn't forget these families, and Democrats haven't.

Again and again, I have joined with my colleagues to call on Republican leadership to bring the Families of Flint Act—that is a bill—to the floor. Flint's Congressman KILDEE's bill would provide supplemental funding to repair and support this community's needs. Lead has often devastating brain development effects, but families can meet that challenge if we provide the health, education, and the wraparound services that they need.

But months later, we have come up dry. No bill to fund Flint aid. No funding for Zika. No gun safety legislation. Nothing.

What is on the floor this week?

Well, we have bills that will help Wall Street make even more money. And we have a bill to impeach the head



of the IRS, mentioned by exactly no one—zero constituents in my district—over the 7-week recess. We have wasted critical weeks during the summer recess, and Republicans are now wasting our first week back in session.

We have only 15 legislative days before we are scheduled to leave town again. Let's get to work and pass the critical funding for Flint and Zika and do something about gun violence.

#### HONORING THE CLEAR RIDGE BASEBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Clear Ridge baseball team on winning the Senior Little League World Series in Bangor, Maine, on August 6. This is the first team from Illinois to ever win this prestigious international tournament during its 56-year history.

The Clear Ridge Senior League Championship team is made up of 16 extraordinary 15- and 16-year-old men from the Garfield Ridge and Clearing neighborhoods in Chicago, all of whom attend area Catholic high schools. Their journeys to becoming champions began as tee-ball players when they were very young. But this Senior League team only came into existence in May of this year. In a short amount of time, they were able to come together to form an extraordinary team.

Clear Ridge showed dominance throughout the summer by not losing a single regular season game. In the postseason, they continued this trend by winning 19 straight games after a single loss to neighboring Burbank National in the first game of the district playoffs.

The championship game pitted Clear Ridge against Asia-Pacific champion, Australia, whom they had already defeated once in the tourney, and who were considered by some to be the team to beat. But Clear Ridge turned out to be that team, prevailing 7-2 to capture the world title.

The following Saturday, I joined hundreds of people at Hale Park to honor players, coaches, and everyone who contributed to the success of the team. The title and the celebration were especially meaningful to me, having played 8 years in Clear Ridge Little League when I was growing up. This team embodies the best of the close-knit neighborhoods on the southwest side of Chicago that I know so well. These are the people who often seem to be forgotten or overlooked in our country today. Many of these kids have parents who are police or firefighters, and all come from hardworking, middle class families.

□ 1115

When I read the names, you will hear a diverse mix of Irish, Mexican, Polish, and other Central European names. The championship players are: Paolo

Zavala, Mike Skoraczewski, Bobby Palenik, Gary Donohue, Gage Olszak, Noah Miller, Tom Doyle, Joe Trezek, Tim Molloy, Dave Navarro, Mike Rios, Jake Gerloski, Jake Duerr, Mel Morario, Julian Lopez, and Zach Verta.

Of course, these kids could not do it on their own. Team manager Mark Robinson and coaches Ray Verta and Will Trezek provided the strong leadership and dedication that helped demonstrate the importance of determination and the results that come from hard work.

Clear Ridge is more than just this one Senior League team. Multiple teams of both boys and girls compete in various leagues. Heading up all of these leagues are President Adam Rush, Vice President Ryan Aderman, and Treasurer Jay Derby. Without the work of these men and countless others who prepare the fields, work the concessions, and do all of the other thankless but necessary jobs, Clear Ridge could not function.

Congratulations go to the parents of all of the players. They not only raised champion baseball players, but good, respectable young men.

Mr. Speaker, when I met with the team at the celebration, I told them how proud they make me, and I encouraged them to keep up the good work. Now I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this great achievement by the Clear Ridge Senior League team and in congratulating them on their world championship. I wish each and every player continued success.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray this day, O Lord, for peace in our world, that freedom will flourish, and righteousness will be done.

The attention of our Nation is drawn toward an impending election, but there is work yet to be done.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House, that they might judiciously balance seemingly irreconcilable interests. Help them to execute their consciences and judgments with clarity and purity of heart, so that all might stand before You honestly and

trust that You can bring forth righteous fruits from their labors.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### CONFRONTING THE ZIKA THREAT TO SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the third time this week since the House reconvened to demand Federal funding to stop the Zika epidemic that is impacting families throughout our Nation, but especially in my area of south Florida.

Reports have suggested that even those individuals charged with protecting our communities—in this case, a police officer from Miami Beach—are not safe from Zika as they do their jobs to patrol our neighborhoods.

Local businesses in the Miami neighborhoods most impacted by Zika are suffering, including those at the lovely Wynwood Yard, a very popular outdoor food and culture scene, where small businesses are suffering from reduced foot traffic.

Many public outdoor areas are being closed to visitors, including the beautiful Miami Beach Botanical Garden after extensive testing found Zika-infected mosquitos on the ground.

The Zika virus is costing residents their peace of mind and access to their public spaces and outdoor recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, we need more Federal funding now to confront this threat. When will Congress act? Every day that we delay is a threat to our families in south Florida.

# NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COUNCIL CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and celebrate the New Hampshire College and University Council, which recently celebrated its 50th anniversary.

I would also like to recognize Thomas Horgan, the president and CEO of the council, who announced earlier this week that he will be stepping down after 23 years on the job. Tom has been a leader in the higher education field for many years and has made a tremendous impact on our community.

The New Hampshire College and University Council has long been committed to working to strengthen the Granite State's higher education system and ensuring that students are given the opportunities they so deserve. The council works tirelessly to collaborate with both public and private institutions and to promote greater awareness and understanding of New Hampshire higher education at every level, from students, professors, and administrators, all the way to the college presidents.

New Hampshire's colleges and universities are major contributors to our State's economy, employing over 17,000 people throughout the Granite State, with salaries and benefits exceeding \$1 billion. Education at every level is vitally important. We must continue to promote higher education in New Hampshire.

## RECOGNIZING MR. GUS BELL

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Gus Bell and his 50 years of service to the Hussey Gay Bell Firm, a design and architecture company located in Savannah, Georgia, dedicated to innovating the engineering field.

Mr. Bell joined the company in 1966 and, with his hard work, purchased the company 20 years later. He then led Hussey Gay Bell's expansion to international clients, proving itself an international pioneer in architecture and engineering.

While a big one, this is only one of Mr. Gus Bell's many accomplishments. For the last five decades, Mr. Bell has also dedicated himself to the enrichment of the State of Georgia. He has chaired the board of Mercer's medical school, founded the St. Andrew's School Board, and represented the State of Georgia in a major water dispute. Mr. Bell's influence is felt throughout the region and, certainly, beyond.

I am honored that Mr. Bell is a resident of Georgia's First Congressional

District, and I thank him for his dedication to our area.

On a personal note, I thank him for all of his assistance to me while I was mayor of the city of Pooler. I am honored to call him my friend.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a warning, a warning that the voices of the American people are at risk of not being heard.

Outside groups funded by the deepest of pockets have taken center stage in this year's election. The Center for Responsive Politics reported this week that outside spending has already reached two-thirds of a billion dollars in 2016. That is more than twice what these groups spent at this point just 4 years ago. Wave after wave of these ads dominate our screens and turn political debate into a pro wrestling match.

But there is more to the problem. This system gives a small group of the wealthiest Americans a disproportionately loud voice. It affirms the fear that so many Americans have that special interests and deep pockets have undue say. That is not good for the future of our country or of our democracy.

It is time we stood up and said, "Enough." It is time we stood up and said that corporations are not people. It is time we pass campaign finance reform, and it is time we revitalize our democracy and bring people power back.

## OBAMA'S CASH PAYMENTS TO IRAN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, sadly, my remarks condemning the shocking \$400 million ransom payment to Iran were understated. Yesterday, The Wall Street Journal revealed:

The Obama administration followed up a plane load of \$400 million in cash sent to Iran in January with two more shipments totaling \$1.3 billion . . . lawmakers have voiced concern that Iran's military units . . . would use the cash to finance military allies, including the Assad regime in Syria, Houthi militias in Yemen, and the Lebanese militia, Hezbollah.

Last month, The Augusta Chronicle disclosed: "No legitimate case can be made that none of the . . . billions . . . will fund terror. It's inevitable. The White House even admits it."

I appreciate House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE's efforts to advance legislation to ensure this can't happen again for enemies who still chant, "Death to America. Death to Israel."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions,

never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. The President's legacy is American families at greater risk of attack, ever, with financing.

## REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN MARK TAKAI

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I attended the funeral of one of our colleagues, my good friend, Congressman Mark Takai of Hawaii, who lost his battle with pancreatic cancer.

Mark was a great leader. He served his country both in the military and the Hawaii National Guard, as well as being a public servant in the Hawaii State House and here in the U.S. Congress.

He was taken from us far too soon. Mark was only 49 and left behind his wife and two children. He was a wonderful father and deserved more time with them.

Pancreatic cancer has one of the lowest survival rates of any cancer. Just 6 percent survive 5 years past their diagnosis. While death rates for other cancers are declining, pancreatic cancer is projected to become the second leading cause of cancer-related death in the U.S. in the next 4 years.

Every year, pancreatic cancer survivors and family members walk the Halls of Congress advocating for more Federal funding for pancreatic cancer research, with the goal of doubling their survival rates by 2020.

For too long, those calls have fallen on deaf ears. But perhaps now, in the wake of losing one of our own colleagues, Congress will do what is right and dedicate much-needed funding to curing this deadly disease.

## TRIBUTE TO MRS. PAT WALKER

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Pat Walker of Springdale, Arkansas, who passed away on September 3 at the age of 97.

Pat was a northwest Arkansas icon whose spirit of philanthropy touched so many lives. She not only provided critical resources for charities involved in medicine, the arts, education, and her beloved Razorbacks, but she also inspired those around her to get involved and be of service to their fellow man.

She was steadfastly dedicated to our community, and the honors bestowed upon Pat are evidence of this. A member of the Arkansas Women's Hall of Fame, Pat was named one of the Most Distinguished Women in Arkansas. She was a lifetime member of the Winthrop P. Rockefeller Cancer Institute, the 2002 American Heart Association Tiffany award recipient, inducted into the Towers of Old Main, and was a member

of the University of Arkansas Chancellor's Society and given the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences Distinguished Service Award.

Northwest Arkansas will long remember the contributions made by Pat Walker, and we join her 2 children, 7 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren in celebrating her wonderful life.

#### VOTING RIGHTS

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of all of those individuals who died or were assaulted trying to register to vote and vote. I rise today in support of all of those individuals who are registering to vote and will vote. I also rise to condemn the assault on Americans' fundamental right to vote.

Across the country, including in my home State of Ohio, we are seeing greater restrictions on voting rights following the Shelby County v. Holder decision. It is no secret these laws are designed to make it harder for Americans to vote, specifically, minorities. They are laws like the one passed by the Ohio Legislature taking away "Golden Week," a week-long period allowing individuals, Mr. Speaker, to both register to vote and cast a ballot at the same time.

Well, I say enough is enough. Our democracy is stronger when all Americans, not just a few select, are able to vote. As our chaplain said today, let us work together so freedoms flourish.

Let us not give up, Mr. Speaker. Let us pass H.R. 885, the Voting Rights Amendment Act, to restore the full power of the Voting Rights Act and right the wrongs created.

#### RECOGNIZING KIMBERLY BIGOS

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kimberly Bigos, a student at Spring Arbor University in my district.

Kimberly created the moving piece of artwork displayed to my left. I have had the privilege to see it in person, and the picture doesn't do it justice. It is a life-size wheelchair made out of little toy green Army men, innocent as they might be. She used more than 1,000 Army men and spent more than 60 hours to finish it.

The sculpture signifies all the aspects of military service, from fighting on the front lines in battle, to returning home with life-altering injuries, to the supreme sacrifice.

America's veterans sacrifice so much and we often lose sight of the effects of their service. Kimberly's sculpture is a powerful reminder about real life for our wounded warriors. These men and women have displayed incredible cour-

age and heroism in service to our country, and now it is time for us to serve them.

□ 1215

#### STARBUCKS AND FEEDING AMERICA TACKLING HUNGER

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to kick off Hunger Action Month, today I joined with Representative LYNN JENKINS of Kansas on a tour of Starbucks on Capitol Hill to learn about an innovative partnership between Feeding America and Starbucks to donate unused food.

At the end of each day, Starbucks will package surplus ready-to-eat food that gets picked up overnight and delivered to local food banks. I was impressed by the selection of nutritious food. We often think of Starbucks as a place to stop for a great cup of coffee, but we saw a number of healthy options like salads, sandwiches, and more.

Starbucks will expand the project to all its stores in the next few years. They expect to donate 50 million meals annually, diverting 60 million pounds of surplus food away from landfills and to hungry families in need.

More than 47 million Americans suffer from hunger and food insecurity. In the richest country in the world, we must do all we can to ensure that no family goes hungry, and donating unused food is a key step. Starbucks deserves much credit for being a leader in the effort to end hunger.

#### SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, Roger Webb, of the University of Manchester, conducted a study which found that when parents have psychiatric illnesses or have attempted suicide, their children are at increased risk for attempting suicide themselves.

Our healthcare system for families with genetic histories of other biological diseases should be no different from those of psychiatric diseases. We must intervene early before the mental health crisis starts. But, unfortunately, in the United States, with too few psychiatric beds, a shortage of psychiatrists and psychologists, and 112 Federal agencies that are a disjointed mess, no, we are not there yet.

But the House passed the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act in July to make a difference in this. We now call upon the Senate to make a difference as well. They need to make sure they pass this bill and don't pass up the opportunity to save lives.

So far, since September 1, 7,672 lives have been lost related to mental illness; and since the House-passed bill, 61,000. We have to understand we must have treatment before these tragedies and provide help before hope.

I hope the Senate passes H.R. 2646 before they leave in September.

#### RECOGNIZING SUSAN MARCHESE

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of Omaha's most illustrious athletes, Susan Marchese. Susan has been a dominant figure in Nebraska amateur golf for 40 years, dating back to her first two high school State championships in 1977 and 1978 as a student athlete at Omaha's Duchesne Academy.

After high school, she attended the University of Oklahoma, where she was a four-time letter winner and an individual runner-up in the Big Eight tournament in 1981.

Throughout the course of her post-college career, Susan has won 18 State amateur golf championships, 16 Omaha city championships, and six Nebraska senior women's golf championships. Her success on the green led to her induction as a member of the Nebraska Golf Hall of Fame, Nebraska High School Hall of Fame, Omaha Athletic Hall of Fame, and the Duchesne Academy Sports Hall of Fame.

Now, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I am here to recognize the outstanding career of Susan Marchese.

#### DEFECTIVE MILITARY EQUIPMENT

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concerns over a recent Justice Department Inspector General report detailing how Federal Prison Industries manufactured defective military equipment that endangered the lives of our troops.

The DOJ investigation into FPI, which is owned and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons found that "FPI had endemic manufacturing problems."

This photo of a test mannequin in an NBC News story about defective prisoner-made equipment shows brain damage likely would have occurred from a small 9 millimeter bullet through a helmet.

Making matters worse, the investigation also uncovered that FPI employees instructed inmates to lie and falsely indicate that the helmets being manufactured had passed inspection and met the required safety specifications. This is completely unacceptable, and potentially criminal.

The FPI response? Reassign the employees.

Can you imagine if these were private sector employees rather than government bureaucrats?

In order to hold FPI accountable, I have introduced H.R. 4671, the Small Business Protection Act. It is our responsibility to supply our troops with the highest quality, American-made gear available. FPI does not deliver on that promise, and I request the support of my colleagues in this endeavor.

#### ZIKA IS A GROWING PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

(Mr. DEUTCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, when we left Washington 7 weeks ago, there were 311 Zika cases in Florida, and no local infections. Now there are over 600 cases, including 56 local infections, and the number of cases in pregnant women has doubled.

Rather than meeting the serious public health crisis with serious policy, Republican leadership is playing a dangerous game by blocking Zika funding to make a political statement about Planned Parenthood and abortion.

We get it. You oppose women exercising their constitutionally protected rights. You would like to live in a world where women don't have access to safe and legal abortion. You want to live in a world where *Roe v. Wade* is not the law of the land and where women do not have access to contraception. Enough.

In the real world, Zika is spread by mosquitoes and Zika spreads through sex. Safe sex means fewer infections, and Planned Parenthood will help in this fight.

It is time to protect American families in the real world, where the Constitution protects women's health care rights, and where we are facing a public health crisis from the Zika virus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Republican leaders to listen to anxious Floridians, Democrats and Republicans alike, who want Congress to act for them and not for attempted political gain.

#### 100 YEARS OF SUPPORT FOR MINNESOTA FARMERS

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Anoka County Farm Bureau. As a supporter of agriculture in Minnesota's Sixth District, the Anoka County Farm Bureau does an excellent job promoting the interests of Minnesota's farmers and their products and produce.

For many farmers in Minnesota, farming is not just a job; it is a way of life often passed from one generation to the next. They work 7 days a week, from dusk till dawn, to ensure that our groceries are stocked and that Minnesotans are fed quality food. It is not an easy job, but it is a vital one.

As the backbone of Minnesota's economy, our farmers deserve as much help

as possible. Without the constant support of the Anoka County Farm Bureau, our district and our State would not be where it is today. That is why I not only want to congratulate the Anoka County Farm Bureau on this very special anniversary, but I want to thank them for supporting Minnesota farmers for the past century, and we look forward to a long future.

#### ZIKA VIRUS IS PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the Zika virus, which has now become a serious public health emergency. Officials from the Department of Health and Human Services have spent August reiterating the dire need for funding to protect the American public from Zika and its potential harm.

While the Centers for Disease Control worked furiously to control and research the mosquitoes that carry this virus, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases labors over finding a vaccine for the virus, Congress has stalled over funding the package.

You have heard the cry from Democrats and Republicans about how serious this is. In the United States, including territories, we currently have 16,832 active Zika virus cases. In south Florida, we now have cases of local transmission that could have been prevented with better vector control and preparedness.

We must give our health professionals the tools they need to fight the spread of this virus. Today I ask that we in Congress do our jobs, please.

#### COMMEMORATING FRANCIS BELLAMY

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Francis Bellamy, one of the most influential individuals from Mount Morris, New York. Francis Bellamy is the author of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Today marks the 124th anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance, which was first published in a magazine called *The Youth's Companion*, on September 8, 1892.

The Pledge was originally written as part of a campaign to put American flags in every school in the United States. In its original form, it read: "I pledge allegiance to my Flag and the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In 1923, the words "the Flag of the United States of America" were added.

In 1954, Congress added the words "under God," creating the 31-word pledge we say today.

Bellamy's words are recited millions of times every day and are ingrained in our society as an expression of national pride and patriotism.

#### HURRICANE HERMINE AND THE NORTH FLORIDA WAY

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, more than 250,000 people were without power. Ten-foot storm surges destroyed homes. Lives were lost. This is what my hometown and north Florida has experienced in the past week as a result of Hermine, the first hurricane to strike Florida in 11 years.

It was one of the worst storms ever to hit north Florida, but throughout all the devastation and destruction, we also witnessed community, kindness, and love, or what I like to call the north Florida way.

Organizations like the Red Cross and Salvation Army sheltered and fed those in need. Churches opened their doors to those suffering, and neighbors took in neighbors to help give them respite and relief from the heat.

Mr. Speaker, it will take weeks and months for us to recover from this storm, but today I want to recognize and thank all organizations, volunteers, workers, and people who have helped us all in our time of need. Thank you from the bottom of my heart. We are truly grateful.

#### HURRICANE HERMINE

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the Tampa Bay Area was impacted by the flooding as a result of Hurricane Hermine. I personally visited the flooded areas in my district throughout the weekend, and I saw families and properties that were devastated. Some of the worst-hit areas were along the Anclote River Basin.

Unfortunately, despite infrastructure improvements throughout the county, this area has been repeatedly impacted by flooding. One potential solution is to dredge the Anclote River to help improve flood water egress through the basin. This will help provide residents with long-term relief.

I have reached out to the Army Corps of Engineers to ask that the agency help craft a permanent, workable solution. The safety of our community is at stake, and I will not rest until we get this done.

#### ZIKA IS A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

(Mr. BERA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, we have got a public health crisis on our hands. We

have to get funding to address the Zika crisis. We now have over 16,000 identified cases. It is a terrible virus, and we have to get ahead of this.

As a doctor and public health expert, I understand the importance of giving our physicians, our healthcare professionals, and our scientists all the tools that they need. The NIH is doing magnificent work getting a vaccine up and running and into clinical trials, but we have to give them the resources; we have to get ahead of this.

We also have to make sure all the patients have access to reproductive healthcare choices, like Planned Parenthood and other assets, so they can prevent the terrible effects of this virus on their fetuses and their babies.

So it is incredibly important, let's get that funding out there. Let's stop playing politics with this, and let's get the help to the places that need it. It is a public health emergency. Let's do our job.

□ 1230

#### SHAME

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, too often victims of human sex trafficking are ashamed. But, Mr. Speaker, the traffickers and the buyers are the ones who should be ashamed and shamed.

Buyers and sellers want to remain anonymous, but those days are over. It is time to use public punishment for their dastardly deeds. As a judge in Texas, I successfully used public punishment.

The SHAME Act will give Federal judges the discretion to publish the names and photographs of convicted human sex traffickers and buyers as well as sending them off to prison. Buyers and sellers who force victims to repeatedly sell their bodies should be publicly shamed for all of us to see.

Photos of slave traders and buyers that appear on billboards will also deter other would-be criminals. Such photographs should appear before large conventions or sporting events—events where trafficking, unfortunately, increases. Let the public see the faces of slave traders and buyers of children—children that are sold on the marketplace of sex trafficking.

Shame traffickers, and shame on them.

And that is just the way it is.

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the House of Representatives to address our broken immigration system, one that serves our na-

tional security poorly, one that inhibits the ability of law enforcement to keep our communities safe and replace it with comprehensive immigration reform so we know who is here, so that people who are here illegally will be required to register and get right with the law and pay a fine, that we provide a pathway to citizenship for people who are here and playing a productive role in our economy, and that we can make sure that parents aren't taken away forcibly from their American citizen children.

It has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office that immigration reform would reduce our budget deficit by over \$200 billion. There are people here today working, Mr. Speaker, and we don't even know if they are paying taxes. We need to make sure that everybody who works in our country pays their just share of taxes, fulfills their responsibilities as legal residents or as citizens of our country, and the only way that we can do that is through congressional action.

I am proud to support comprehensive immigration reform. I call upon Speaker RYAN and the Republican majority to put a bill forward that secures our border, reduces our deficit, and provides a way that people are required to get right with the law and have workplace authentication.

#### DEMAND ACTION ON ZIKA

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, with summer coming to an end and a new school year underway, the threat of Zika still lingers on, a threat we in the House took up months ago.

The House passed legislation back in June ensuring the administration would continue to have resources in place to protect the public from the threat of Zika. This legislation came with tight restrictions to ensure the funds are spent appropriately. Despite this and after already agreeing to the proposed funding levels, Senate Democrats have repeatedly blocked this much-needed funding. Tuesday night, HARRY REID and Senate Democrats, again, voted to block this legislation—leaving the public's health in limbo.

This is unacceptable. Before the district work period, I joined my colleagues in the Georgia delegation, along with our Senators, ISAKSON and PERDUE, in a letter to the President demanding that we put aside politics and urge immediate passage of Zika funding.

With newly reported Zika cases in our country daily, we should be focusing on protecting Americans from this virus and not petty politics.

I am so thankful that our 12th grandchild, Robin Hampton Wills, born Monday, January 12, did not have to face this threat. That is why I urge Senate Democrats to give up partisan politics

and move this legislation forward so that families do not have to face the threat of this terrible virus.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF CAPTAIN ROBERT "DAVE" MELTON

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Captain Robert "Dave" Melton, who was killed in the line of duty several weeks ago in Kansas City, Kansas, in my district.

Each night we sleep soundly knowing that there are men and women patrolling the streets and guarding our borders to keep us safe and defend our freedom. Like Captain Melton, they put themselves in harm's way out of service to our community and to our country.

When one of these brave Americans loses their life in the line of duty and on our behalf, it is a devastating blow to all who wear the uniform and the families who support them. My heart breaks at each and every loss of one of these heroes.

Captain Melton is a true hero who served 17 years in law enforcement and did tours in the military in Iraq and Afghanistan throughout his distinguished career of service to our country. He did not deserve to have his life cut short at age 46.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless Captain Melton, his family, and all those who serve our great Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING DEMARCUS COUSINS

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mobile native DeMarcus Cousins for winning an Olympic gold medal as a member of the U.S. Men's Basketball Team.

Throughout Olympic play, he averaged 9.1 points and 5.8 rebounds. While his play on the court is to be commended, I was more impressed by DeMarcus' work back home in Alabama. DeMarcus recently held a free basketball camp for young children at his alma mater, LeFlore Magnet High School.

Following the basketball camp, DeMarcus organized an important conversation about relations between members of the African American community and law enforcement.

Like many communities across the Nation, my hometown of Mobile has faced our share of challenges in this area; but thanks to local leaders and leaders like DeMarcus Cousins, Mobile can serve as a prime example of how to defuse racial tension and increase understanding between all members of our community.

So on behalf of Alabama's First Congressional District, I want to, again, congratulate DeMarcus on his gold

medal and applaud him for his continued leadership in our community.

#### CONGRATULATING DAVID PLUMMER

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Wayzata's David Plummer on winning the bronze medal in the 100-meter backstroke in this year's Olympic Games.

David's path to the Olympics was not an easy one. David is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota and the very first former Golden Gopher men's swimmer to win an Olympic medal for the United States. After missing the 2012 games in London by a fraction of a second, he thought his Olympic aspirations might be shattered. However, David never gave up and continued to pursue his dream. This year, at the age of 30, he made the Olympic team and reached his goal of competing and winning the bronze medal at the Olympic Games.

On top of his achievements in the pool, David is also a leader in our community. He is the head coach of the Wayzata High School boys' swim and dive team, leading them to a State championship in his first season, as well as winning Minnesota's State Coach of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, we can draw inspiration from David's determination to overcome any obstacle. David has made the State of Minnesota and our entire country proud.

Congratulations, David.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2357, ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT OF 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5424, INVESTMENT ADVISERS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 844 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 844

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in

this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-62. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5424) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 and to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend its rules to modernize certain requirements relating to investment advisers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I

may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which is a fair rule that makes in order every single amendment submitted to the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, and H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016.

This package comes to the floor via the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, Chairman JEB HENSARLING, who brought this package to the Rules Committee because of the needs of the American people and the needs of the financial services industry that is trying to grow jobs, investment, and opportunity for people in America.

We have an incredible opportunity before us today, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity to take good ideas, good ideas that come directly from the American people. It is called the financial services industry of the United States of America, men and women who get up and handle our financial needs, many men and women who not only have dedicated themselves to the success of this country, but also to the success of the American people.

We are trying to take this opportunity to move those ideas that they bring to us today through the House of Representatives so that we have a bill that we can present on a bipartisan basis to the United States Senate and to the President of the United States and say these are great ideas.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that your work that you do personally to make sure these ideas are brought forth not only to the Financial Services Committee, but to other areas of this Congress to make sure that we are passing legislation that is about jobs, job creation, and the availability of the American people to have a better shot at the American Dream, is why we are here today.

□ 1245

The goal of this rule and the underlying legislation is simple: to keep the flow of capital moving across our capital markets, to make it easier—not harder—to make it easier to overcome barriers for small businesses, entrepreneurs, and startups to have the capital that they desperately need to grow and thrive.

Mr. Speaker, this part of the American Dream is someone who has great ideas, the ability, and the desire, and to take those ideas and match it up with the capital, a marketing plan, and the ability to move forth in that plan.



That is part of the American Dream to make not only your life better but, along the way, a bunch of other people who meet their American Dream also.

Capital is the lifeblood of growing new companies—not a surprise—and access to capital can literally make or break small business. Mr. Speaker, it can make or break a person's great idea also. That is why we are here today on the floor. Good ideas that come from men and women in the industry, men and women who talk to the Financial Services Committee on a partisan basis, men and women of this Congress bringing these great ideas, and it is all on behalf of trying to give people a better shot at the American Dream through growing companies accessing capital and making the hard break become successful.

I have seen firsthand the detriment of overregulation in industries and poorly written laws, and I have also seen the power of the free enterprise system. While serving as chairman on the board of the Greater East Dallas Chamber of Commerce, I saw, firsthand, companies that could not get the capital that they needed because they weren't large enough to qualify or perhaps had some other burden or impediment in front of them.

As we know today, because of technology, time, and people's purpose, we have the opportunity for doing something remarkable. We have the ability today to enact legislation that will bolster opportunities for small businesses to secure capital, to reduce the strain of a one-size-fits-all regulatory regime, and to take that and add an opportunity to overcome these by using the American spirit and killing regulatory things that stand in the way. That is why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, over 6 months ago, the Obama administration actually identified the Zika virus as a public health crisis. It is well reported on. My constituents are aware of it. It has already affected many Americans in States like Florida, Texas, and Louisiana. The Obama administration requested additional resources to combat the virus.

The White House and the CDC correctly predicted that the virus would soon spread to the Southern United States. In fact, just as Congress left for its 7-week break, there were several reports of Zika transmission in south Florida. In fact, just last week, the Director of the CDC warned that, without congressional action, they will soon run out of money for combating Zika.

Now, in a moment, I will talk about the bills we are considering, but I think the American people expect Congress to react to a public health crisis. Had we reacted 7 weeks ago, perhaps we wouldn't be where we are today. I need and call upon this body to act

today so that we are in a better situation 7 weeks hence.

In fact, the House is only in session for 15 more days before taking at least a 6-week break in October and November. In the handful of days we have left, it is critical to provide an emergency package to fight back against Zika. That is not currently on the calendar, Mr. Speaker. Instead, we are considering these bills. I will be going into the merits and lack thereof of them; but certainly, I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with the objective assessment that these bills do nothing to combat Zika or address the public health concerns around Zika.

The Senate did pass a partisan Zika funding bill to provide emergency resources. It doesn't have unrelated poison pills unrelated to Zika. Obviously, issues like where or if the flag of the rebel States, the Confederate flag, is displayed, or whether Planned Parenthood is funded, these are contentious issues here, but I think we all agree they have nothing to do with Zika. The Confederate flag does not have an impact on Zika. Planned Parenthood has at least a related aspect to it—reproductive health.

Of course, one of the symptoms or one of the effects of Zika is a higher rate of microcephaly among children that are born to women who suffer from Zika while they are pregnant. So certainly the family planning aspect of it is relevant, but not central, to the issues affecting public health around Zika. We need to make sure that there aren't any of those poison pill provisions and move forward.

Instead, we have different bills here. We have bills related to financial markets.

The first one is the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016. That one brings together several different bills that had been offered.

First, it includes a bill that affects microcap companies, or pink sheet companies, and removes many of the SEC transparency regulations around how they sell stock and how they are listed. It is not a step forward for transparency. In fact, this kind of effort is likely to decrease confidence in our public marketplace. It is likely to hurt the very stock market that presumably it was designed to help.

This would effectively allow microcap companies worth less than \$75 million with one class of securities to issue an unlimited number of shares using shelf registration in a 12-month period, not even notifying the SEC ahead of the issuance, and permit unlisted microcap companies to sell up to one-third of the aggregate market value of their common equity using shelf registration in a 12-month period.

In many ways, these provisions are at odds with the other bills that I will talk about, which provides some regulatory relief towards private equity by favoring small cap public companies. It is hard for a small company to be pub-

lic. It is questionable whether small cap companies should be public.

When we talk about private equity in a moment, we will see that one of the features of that is: A, they have, of course, a more sophisticated ownership; and, B, they have a more concentrated ownership. So, for instance, the issues like runaway executive pay, CEO pay, is less of a problem with private equity and a significant problem with public companies, and, again, in particularly small cap companies with diffuse ownership, which this bill would likely lead to more of.

It would also remove exchange protections like corporate governance requirements. Again, these kinds of measures reduce confidence in the public marketplace, they hurt the stock market, and, in the immediate and long term, they hurt the ability of companies to go public and access public capital because of the reputation of the pink sheets and the reputation of microcap.

It is a fine line. I am sure that we would probably agree on some regulatory relief around small cap companies, but this package is not it. This package would hurt the stock market, hurt access to capital, and hurt the very legitimate players that it is designed to help.

The second bill in here is the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. It would eliminate Federal and State investor protection around crowdfunding in regulation A under certain conditions.

First, I was an original sponsor of the JOBS bill. I worked with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get that through. I will be among the first to say that I was disappointed with the way that that has been implemented by the administration. Crowdfunding should be easy. It should not have 900 pages of regulations.

The main consumer safeguard that we have in there is that nonaccredited investors are only allowed to invest up to \$10,000. That is a very important protection that we have. This would eliminate that protection under several circumstances. One, if there are 35 or fewer purchasers; or, two, the aggregate amount of securities sold by the issuer is \$500,000 or less in a 1-year period. It basically does away with one of the legislatively imposed consumer protections in the JOBS Act.

Now, I would agree. I think there has been some regulatory-imposed inhibitions in the JOBS Act that I wish that we could strike out in a laser-like way with a scalpel. In fact, many States, including my own State of Colorado, have implemented more sensible bipartisan crowdfunding legislation that enables it to occur at least within a State in a much easier way than the very cumbersome Federal law which does inhibit both the use of crowdfunding as well as the presence of crowdfunding as part of an overall capital strategy because of the difficulties concerning other types of capital investors and capital partners.

I would love to see reform of the JOBS Act or reform around micro offering, but this particular answer really undermines the entire concept of the consumer protections. It is not targeted. It removes the protections for smaller of the smallest of the small offerings. And again, what you would find and the danger here is folks—we can call them scam artists or folks trying to make a buck off of this and not build legitimate businesses—can simply set up a number of companies each raising under \$500,000 to meet the criteria of this exemption. There is not any consumer protection around that. There is nothing to stop a bad actor from asking for significant investments for each of those companies, even from the same individual depleting the savings of that individual rather than sticking to the \$10,000 cap, which was in our JOBS Act.

So again, I would like, and many of my colleagues on my side of the aisle would like, crowdfunding to be easier, to be done quicker, to remove some of the excess paperwork and regulation A requirements, but maintaining that basic consumer safeguard and not providing exemptions just because there are 35 or fewer purchasers or \$500,000 or less over a 1-year period. It doesn't even address overlapping ownership or related status between, again, multiple companies that might each raise \$500,000, might substantially have the same external owners, but would get around the JOBS Act consumer protection provisions by effectively cloning a bunch of small companies and offering them up separately for individual investors. These things need to be thought through.

There is a kernel of an idea in there. I agree that the administration has gone beyond the legislative intent of the JOBS Act in its implementation of the JOBS Act. There is, hopefully, a way that we can work together to empower crowdfunding to play a more central role in capital development in entrepreneurship in our country. This bill is not it.

The final component of that bill, the Private Placement Improvement Act of 2016, would make it very difficult for the SEC to finalize investor protections that it proposed back in 2013. The title would require issuers selling securities under an exemption that allows companies to raise an unlimited amount of money to file within 15 days of sale a single notice of sale, which the SEC would then be required to make available to State and other regulators.

This relates to some current rules that the SEC is moving forward with. I think that, again, there is a way to tweak those rules, but I don't think that this is the way to do it, to allow for unlimited capital to be raised under a single notice of sale. And, of course, this also affects the prerogative of State regulators, and there are a variety of practices there, by requiring the SEC to make it available to State and other regulators.

I think that there is room for improvement in that area, but, again, the bill falls short.

Now, the other bill, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, a majority of Democrats on the committee support it. Many also voiced concerns. Some were the concerns of the Obama administration about some of those provisions. But I am glad to say that many of those concerns have been addressed by my colleague's, Mr. FOSTER's, amendment.

First, a little bit about private equity and what this bill does and doesn't do.

□ 1300

My State and my district, like, probably, every other district in the country, has seen the benefits and the impact of private equity investment in its providing growth capital to companies, providing stability in ownership. There are over 100 private equity-backed companies headquartered in Colorado that we know of that support close to 100,000 jobs in Colorado. In 2015, private equity firms invested \$12 billion in Colorado-based companies. They are real jobs, and they have contributed to the economic growth that Colorado has seen over the last few years and that the country will see over the next few years.

Private equity has helped to create and sustain thousands of jobs and has made substantial investments in every State in the country. It provides returns to public pensions, to university endowments, to many people as part of their own individual retirement plans and savings. It is important both from a capital perspective and from an operating perspective—a very important sector. Firms that are owned by private equity—at least, because, again, there could be some that are not part of this—employ over 8 million people. The private equity industry invested over \$600 billion into these companies. For physical infrastructure, for additional hires, for expansion, private equity has been a source of capital for Main Street businesses across our country, in my State, and everywhere else in the country.

That is why the bill passed the Financial Services Committee with a majority of Democrats—with strong bipartisan support—and I think it will pass this body with strong bipartisan support as well.

Of course, there have been stories about bad actors in private equity just as there could be bad actors among any type of ownership entity. That is what private equity is. It is a type of entity that may own a local company.

What are the other kinds of ownership that a company may have?

It may have public ownership. It may be public. We talked about that in the microcap bill. In many ways, that is a worse form of ownership in that there is additional administrative overhead that is associated with being public. Even if the regulatory relief were to

become the law, there is still significant additional overhead with being public. It is very difficult for a \$20 million or a \$50 million company.

Two, because of the diffuse ownership, frequently, there is no one watching the shop, meaning that management runs it. We have the problems of excess CEO pay, of excess executive pay. There are horror stories of CEOs making hundreds of times the pay of the line workers. Those kinds of things don't happen in private equity-backed companies. There is someone minding the shop, and the entity that is minding the shop is an entity that is looking for long-term growth, for long-term stability. They are not in and out.

There has been some confusion among Members of this body in discussing hedge funds versus private equity. Private equity is not a hedge fund. Hedge funds have liquidity, and they make transactions rapidly. They don't participate in governance and growth. Private equity is very, very different. It is more analogous to venture capital. They are in there for 5 years, 6 or 7 years, 10 years—long-term investors who are building the companies, serving on boards, recruiting others to serve on boards, providing sound corporate governance, making sure that CEOs and executives aren't paid too much, making sure that talent is in the company, making sure that growth capital is available.

H.R. 5424 just takes a scalpel approach to existing regulations by focusing on aspects of SEC adviser registration that impede the capital formation in the private equity industry. For instance, there are provisions in the bill that would make reporting to the SEC more efficient and effective for their purposes and less costly and burdensome for private equity firms.

Keep in mind that private equity firms do not represent, in any way, shape, or form, a systemic risk to our Nation's financial security. They are simply a type of ownership that Main Street companies have. If a private equity firm invests poorly, runs companies poorly, they will deliver a very poor return for their investors. That does not impact in any systemic way the economy in the way that a hedge fund—placing highly leveraged bets on derivatives or on some other financial instrument—can cause an entire economic meltdown, as we saw during the mortgage-backed security crisis in 2008 and in 2009.

Private equity firms provide patient, stable, long-term capital to privately owned businesses across the country. In fact, they help take the emphasis off of the quarterly financial reports that are so important for public companies.

One of the failures of public company governance is that there is too much emphasis on the short term at the expense of the long term—too much emphasis to pump up the quarter at the expense of medium- and long-term growth—2 years, 3 years, 4 years—in underinvestment in research and in

underinvestment in long-term growth. Having a private equity ownership of an operating company addresses that kind of moral hazard that exists with regard to the incentives of the public marketplace.

Private equity firms have a long-term outlook that results in lower volatility. While the public company model may not perform as well as private equity firms, it, obviously, can provide access to capital, to additional liquidity that private equity doesn't have. The two are related in that, for some private equity investors, their goal is a public offering exit in the 5-to-10-year time frame. That is not always the case, but that can be the case; and having an operable public market in addition to a private equity market is, of course, of interest and importance to the private equity industry as well, which is why the reforms in the other bill are so bad, because they deteriorate confidence in the stock market. They ultimately will result in decreasing liquidity for the good actors, meaning some of the private equity-backed or owner-operator-owned companies that want to have a public partial exit or exit through the public marketplace.

Again, the bill isn't perfect. The White House identified a number of issues. But, fortunately, my colleague, Representative FOSTER, offered an amendment, which has been accepted and, hopefully, that will address a number of these issues.

The amendment removes a provision of the bill that would have allowed certain ancillary or minor funds or entities that are affiliated with a private equity firm to also be exempt from annual audits or surprise inspections. It addresses concerns around transparency by continuing the current requirement that advisers provide information about fees and services in a brochure. It restores the transparency elements while maintaining the concept of the regulatory relief of redundant regulations with regard to capital formation and private equity.

The goal is to enact this common-sense bill that will make it more efficient for private equity firms to operate and continue to grow businesses on Main Street in districts like mine and across the country while simultaneously maintaining the regulatory regime to make sure that nothing untoward is occurring.

The bill does not, as some have falsely argued, allow private equity firms to escape regulation by any stretch. In fact, most private equity firms have embraced the changes that have been implemented under Dodd-Frank. They have compliance teams to make sure they are operating properly under the new regulatory scheme. In any form, they do not represent a systemic risk, but to protect investors, many of them agree with the sensible regulations that have been imposed with the exception of those that we are seeking to remove that are redundant and that cre-

ate overhead. When you create overhead for private equity firms, that results in less investment in our Main Street businesses. If they have to divert funds to comply with unnecessary regulations for the sake of regulations, it is that much less money and that many fewer jobs in your Main Street businesses located in your districts.

The substitute amendment makes positive changes to the legislation. It addresses many of the concerns that have been raised about the bill. I and many of my colleagues plan to support its passage and also take this occasion to make sure that our colleagues are aware of the contributions of this particular model of ownership to our Main Street businesses. It has been a growth sector, in fact, largely due to showing, over time, superior performance to companies that have a public governance model, in fact, in large part, due to their dissipated owner base and lack of concentration in ownership.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's not only observations as a business leader from Colorado, but as a member of the Rules Committee. He recognizes the need for ideas to flow up from the industry to Members of Congress, for us to, on a bipartisan basis, approach these issues to where we can provide safety and soundness for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delano, Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the gentleman who is offering his legislation, which is a part of title II of the legislation.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, government doesn't create jobs; people create jobs. But with the President, Congress can create Federal policies that establish a pro-worker and pro-business environment to lift people out of poverty, to help families, and to allow Americans to realize their greatest dreams.

One problem today that is impeding job growth is the access to capital for small business. Often, American entrepreneurs can't get the money they need to start a new enterprise or to grow an existing one. In fact, small businesses still create the majority of new jobs in our country today despite the fact that far fewer small business loans are being made today than were being made prior to the 2008 recession.

Compounding this problem even further is the unfortunate reality that entrepreneurs from less affluent communities often have the greatest difficulty in securing the capital they need to make their business dreams come true. As a result, thousands of jobs and hundreds of new products are left on the drawing board as unrealized aspirations of American entrepreneurs. Thankfully, if the rule before us today is adopted, the House can consider four solutions that will address this small business access to capital problem immediately.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016 will make it easier for businesses to raise capital. First, thanks to Congresswoman WAGNER, this legislation will make it easier for small companies to comply with SEC security registration requirements by simplifying the process, by eliminating duplicative paperwork, and by, ultimately, allowing people to do their business instead of compliance.

Second, thanks to Congressman GARRETT's Private Placement Improvement Act, the bill will make it easier for small businesses to raise capital under rule 506 of regulation D, ultimately leading to greater access to capital for small businesses and unleashing the full potential of title II of the JOBS Act.

Third, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act will make it easier for Americans to raise capital from friends and family if three simple criteria are met. These three criteria include that the investor has a substantive preexisting relationship with the owner, that there are 35 or fewer investors, and that the aggregate amount of the investment does not exceed \$500,000.

Additionally, this provision would exempt such offerings from blue sky requirements, but with all Federal and State antifraud laws remaining in effect. It is important to note that this micro offering proposal does not create a new law, but, rather, simply clarifies an existing law by making an explicit safe harbor for certain private security offerings under the Securities Act of 1933.

Finally, thanks to Congressman HURT and Congressman VARGAS, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act will modernize the Investment Advisers Act by removing redundancies and making necessary enhancements to increase capital formation.

With American productivity decreasing, wages essentially stagnant, and the U.S. economy struggling to get to historically normal GDP growth levels, these proposals in the Accelerating Access to Capital Act will help jump-start our ailing economy. By providing new opportunities to make the most of capital formation vehicles that are already available or by creating new ones, these proposed reforms will enable American entrepreneurs and small businesses to access the capital they need to grow and to prosper.

I thank the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for prioritizing the consideration of these pro-business, pro-jobs, and antipoverty bills. I encourage my colleagues in the House to support the rule. This is a tremendous opportunity for the House to support Main Street mom-and-pop stores, aspiring entrepreneurs, and established manufacturers to create jobs, wealth, and opportunity for Americans from all walks of life.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do have a speaker, but I can't locate her right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you just heard from one of our brightest new members of the Committee on Financial Services. This committee is full, on a bipartisan basis, of men and women who care very much about growing our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee and the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation of this H.R. 2357. It encompasses, by the way, H.R. 4850, and this is the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act.

What I will share with my colleagues is that California is the innovation capital of the world. From Silicon Valley to Orange County, technology startups are reimagining the way that the world works, and these new companies don't have thousands of people on payroll.

□ 1315

They don't need dozens of floors of office space. They don't need billions of dollars to function, but they do need capital. They need that capital to operate. Our current regulatory framework creates impediments to these small businesses tapping into the market.

According to the Federal Reserve, the startup rate has fallen sharply over the past 30 years. It was 14 percent of total companies in a given year, but today it is down to 8 percent. The likelihood of a young firm being a high-growth firm has also declined over the years, and these trends are alarming, if you think about the consequences. These trends need to be reversed.

The Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act turns the tide by lowering compliance burdens for firms seeking low-dollar investments from a small group of investors that they have a relationship with. So the legislation appropriately scales the regulatory oversight of capital formation, while keeping intact investor protections.

The resources that startups would sink into compliance and legal costs could be redirected—to what?—to hiring workers, redirected to creating new products. Uber, Google, and Airbnb, these were all startups. Passage of the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act ensures that the next success story will be told.

I thank Mr. EMMER of Minnesota for his work on this important issue.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman talked about the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. Again, I think that there is the kernel of a good idea there, if the good idea would be to streamline the excess regulation above and beyond the consumer safeguards that were put in the JOBS Act; if the bill, for instance, were to take

some of the best practices from the States, including my home State of Colorado, around crowdfunding and put them into a revised version of Federal direction.

To be clear, I would join my colleagues in agreeing that the administration went well beyond the expressed legislative intent and legislative language of the JOBS Act in creating barriers to micro financing across the country. Unfortunately, that is not what this bill does.

It cuts back by providing gaping loopholes on the consumer protections that Congress very thoughtfully intended to put in the JOBS Act. So these are not the unintended regulatory aspects that the administration added to the JOBS Act. These are cutting away at the very consumer protections which Congress deliberately—including, as one of the coauthors of the bill along with my Republican colleagues, Mr. ISSA and many others, the protections that we actually put into the bill, this would gut. So, again, a kernel of a good idea.

Perhaps the inception of this bill is, hey, we messed up on the implementation of crowdfunding. Let's fix it. Unfortunately, that is not what this bill does. I wish it was what this bill does. It is something I am certainly interested in doing. I think many of my Democratic colleagues are, and we would be happy to work on a bipartisan basis to address the poor implementation of the JOBS Act.

Of course, if there was something expressly provided legislatively, we would be happy to go back and look at that. But this glaring loophole that is opened is simply not it, with regard to if there are fewer than 35 purchasers, under \$500,000, some kind of preexisting relationship. These loopholes are simply too broad and would effectively remove the consumer protections that we have in crowdfunding.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation, which I am proud to support. It would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

If somebody is on the FBI terrorist watch list, they should not be allowed to quietly assemble an arsenal to commit a terrorist act. In fact, the FBI should immediately be on top of the situation, find out their intent, and see what is going on. It is a commonsense bill that would help keep America safe. My amendment would give the House an opportunity to simply vote on this commonsense bill, which so far, unfortunately, the Republicans have not even allowed us to debate. We cannot wait any longer for Congress to take meaningful action to reduce the risk of terrorism in our own country, and this bill would do that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with extra-

neous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about thoughtful young members of the Financial Services Committee, who work with people all across the United States who are engaged in financial services to bring more capital to bear, not only for small business, but also better investment tools, investor tools. We have had the advantage of having not only Mr. POLIS, a young entrepreneur from Colorado, but we have had ED ROYCE. We have had TOM EMMER.

We now would like to have another very bright, young man who serves on the Financial Services Committee to talk to us, who brings this bill to us from Winfield, Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 844, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, and H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act.

I know how hard my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee worked in crafting this legislation that will strengthen our economy. I am, also, grateful for the hard work to make sure that this is a bipartisan effort. I was proud to support this legislation in the committee, and I am hopeful it will see a strong vote of approval when voted here on the House floor.

I am proud to join Representatives VARGAS, STIVERS, FOSTER, and SINEMA as a cosponsor of Mr. HURT's legislation, H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act. The modest changes that this legislation would make makes it easier to invest in job creators, our families, and our communities.

Dan Gallagher, a recent Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission, agrees and has testified in the Financial Services Committee that the bill "preserves the registration regime for private fund advisers while at the same time removing or modernizing—in rather modest ways—some of the more unnecessary, outdated, and overly burdensome requirements of the now 76-year old Advisers Act that drive costs up for funds and investors, and hinder the efficient allocation of capital to help grow businesses and create jobs."

These changes will make it easier to invest in our communities, and these administrative savings then can be passed on to investors.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act, led by my colleague on the Financial Services Committee Mrs. WAGNER,

would make it easier for small businesses and entrepreneurs to access the capital they need to grow their companies and create jobs.

It is important that we have smart regulations in place that provide certainty to investors and to our markets. It is equally important that the Securities and Exchange Commission not unnecessarily inhibit capital formation. In fact, the agency has a mission that states these two things should be treated with equal importance.

This important package of legislation includes relatively modest but meaningful changes to our securities laws that will improve access to capital for smaller businesses and entrepreneurs without jeopardizing consumer protection.

Title I of this package authorized by Mrs. WAGNER makes it easier for more small companies to use a less burdensome document when registering with the SEC. Over the last 5 years, the number of smaller companies—those with less than 500 employees—has declined. This is the first time that this has happened since the U.S. Census Bureau began keeping data on the subject.

In 2012, the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation report included a recommendation to modernize and expand the utility of form S-3 for a great number of public companies. This is just what Mrs. WAGNER's legislation proposes to do.

Furthermore, the report noted that investor protection concerns have been substantially eliminated with the advanced information technology, including EDGAR, which is the SEC's electronic disclosure filing system.

The Accelerating Access to Capital Act includes two other very important titles. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) has put forth legislation that would exempt certain micro offerings from the registration requirement of the Securities Act of 1933. This important change in law would allow a startup business—the engines driving growth in our economy—to solicit friends and family to invest in their businesses.

Investors with a preexisting relationship with those most committed to the company's success likely have the greatest understanding of its growth trajectory and prospects for generating a healthy return on investment. This will allow small business to access capital without having to navigate more complicated Federal securities registration or win approval of the SEC. Mr. EMMER's legislation will help fuel growth on Main Street and help create the jobs our constituents deserve.

Mr. GARRETT, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises and a strong leader on these issues, has put forth legislation to ensure the SEC returns more of its focus to supporting capital formation, just as Congress intended in the JOBS Act.

Mr. GARRETT's legislation would direct the SEC to revise regulation D, so fewer small businesses are required to register their securities with the agency. It would help eliminate some of the most excessive regulation we hear about far too often from our constituents.

The legislation will allow entrepreneurs and small businesses to go back to doing what they do best—innovating and creating jobs—ensuring families in our communities have a paycheck to put food on the table, can cover the increasing costs of health care, and provide opportunities to help their children be successful in the world.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee for all of this hard work. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the rule and the legislation to follow.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in fact, in this colloquy, I do have an additional speaker, and then I would choose to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Financial Services has presented a number of their members who have come to the floor today to offer thoughts and ideas on a bipartisan basis, thoughts and ideas that have emanated up from literally financial services experts across the country, commonsense ideas, and investor ideas. They have been vetted. They have been looked at. They have been talked about. They have been marked up on a bipartisan basis; and that is why we are here today, to make capital easier and more available from an investor perspective, as well as from the perspective of the financial services industry.

One of the leaders from the Financial Services Committee for a number of years has been our next speaker, and I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to a favorite son of St. Elizabeth, Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman and friend from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for that eloquent introduction. I also thank him for all of his hard work on his committee as well as bringing this important bill to the floor.

I also want to recognize my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GARRETT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. HURT, for their tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's investors and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, today or tomorrow, the House will consider legislation that will allow small businesses and those starting or investing in small businesses to access needed capital without being subject to burdensome and unnecessary regulation.

As we have seen throughout the financial services sector and across our economy, one-size-fits-all rules are damaging our Nation's businesses, financial institutions, and, as a result, American workers and their families. Main Street has been crushed under the weight of this administration's regulatory regime, as even the ranking member admits.

H.R. 2357, composed of three bills that passed the Financial Services Committee earlier this year, simplifies registration requirements for small companies and facilitates access to capital without triggering costly regulatory expenditures.

H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act of 2016, eliminates duplicative requirements for investment advisers, allows for greater capital formation and development, and streamlines elements of the 76-year-old Investment Advisers Act.

I recently met with a company in my district that relied upon private equity to stay afloat and continued to employ my constituents. Capital should be used to create jobs and spur economic growth and, as the chairman mentioned in his opening remarks, to help Americans realize the American Dream. Capital should not be used to fulfill meaningless and unproductive regulatory requirements.

Our economy sits in idle. It is time to put it in drive. Regulation should serve to protect taxpayers and not hurt them. It should enhance the economy, not stymie it. There is no room for regulation that serves to appease bureaucratic demands.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I come from the business world, and in another life I was a banker on the regulatory side of the table as well as a bank examiner. I have seen the impact of rules and regulations on small businesses and communities, and my community as well. I have looked across the table and helped those small businesses get started. Capital is the lifeblood of these small businesses being able to start businesses, help employ people, and be able to help people have jobs and enhance the communities that they come from. It is extremely important.

These discussions that we are having today are important from the standpoint of enhancing our ability as a nation to continue to thrive and grow, and to stymie what is hurting ourselves. The statistics are there. Small businesses have been deteriorating. We have lost more small businesses in the last several years than we have had. So, therefore, why do you think we have the jobs problem that we have today? It is pretty evident to me.

This rule and the underlying bills we will consider during the remainder of this week will move us towards an economic recovery and a more responsible regulatory environment.

I want to, again, thank my colleagues on the Committee on Financial

Services and the Committee on Rules for their work on these issues and for their advocacy on behalf of our Nation's investors, small businesses, and employees.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas prepared to close?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would expect at this time that I have no further speakers and will close when given that opportunity.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, while I do applaud Democrats and Republicans for coming together around H.R. 5424, the Investment Advisers Modernization Act, I wish that we had come together around the pressing public health crisis of Zika. I wish we had come together to prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals to commit terrorist acts in our country. Unfortunately, while the Senate has acted in a bipartisan way to address Zika, House Republicans continue to sit on their hands and ignore this critical public health issue. The CDC is quickly running out of money to combat Zika. We have yet to even begin serious discussions on comprehensive immigration reform, with only a couple months left in this session, not to mention the crisis of lead in the pipes in Flint, Michigan. And, of course, in the weeks after the deadliest mass shooting in our Nation's history, Congress has not acted on anything around preventing violence, as well.

We should be voting on those kinds of bills. Many of those are also bipartisan, just as this private equity bill is, but I would argue that they are more timely, more important. Instead of focusing on policies that help save lives, Republicans are instead spending time on two bills, one of which will almost certainly receive a veto from the President. The other one, we hope that Mr. FOSTER's amendment addresses the issues the President had with it, but both of which are not likely to pass the United States Senate.

We are spending more of our time and taxpayer money ignoring the most pressing issues before us, issues that could move through the Senate, issues that I hear about from my constituents every day back home.

Again, I applaud the Democrats and Republicans coming together around the H.R. 5424 bill. This bill, if it were to become law, would absolutely encourage greater investment in mainstream businesses in our communities. It might make the difference of them making that additional hire or two. That might be your neighbor; that might be your cousin; that might be your spouse; it might even be you, that extra job or two or three that is created by encouraging private capital resources to be put into our communities.

Again, private equity had nothing to do with the financial meltdown in 2008 and 2009. There is nothing systemic about it. It is simply ownership groups of companies, and whether those own-

ers are local ownership groups, whether they are founders, whether they are family offices, whether they are private equity, whether they are publicly traded, they all have pros and cons.

We, of course, like to think of the very idealized vision of a mainstream business where it is owned by your neighbor and somebody who is accountable that you know, but those kinds of businesses have transition issues as well. When their owner-operator gets ill or passes on, what is to become of those businesses? What is the route to sustainability? How can we make sure they continue to add value in the community? For many, for transition planning, private equity can provide that answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill and defeat the previous question so we can reduce the risk of a terrorist attack in our country, and vote "no" on this restrictive, misguided rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Texas has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and thank my colleague, Mr. POLIS. Today has been a thoughtful exercise where there was some disagreement. That is okay. That does not bother me, and it should not bother him that he had to speak his mind in areas that he felt were important.

But today, Mr. Speaker, Mr. POLIS has very objectively been able to critique the bill in front of us, to provide his analysis of that bill, acknowledging it is a bipartisan bill, acknowledging that this bill is about jobs, job creation, making life better, albeit that it might be one or two people in a neighborhood. This country is full of neighborhoods and full of people who want a better job, people who want a better opportunity to invest, people who want to have their ideas taken up, and this bill came directly to us today from back home, back home people who have ideas, back home people who are looking at rules and regulations and saying, wow, that is an impediment to my good idea.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. EMMER, Chairman ROYCE all said, oh, by the way, they have an American Dream they are trying to live up to also, and there are things that are getting in the way of their dream. So they do the things that are necessary to float their ideas up to their Member of Congress. It came to the Committee on Financial Services. The young chairman, JEB HENSARLING, creates ideas that are able to move to legislation. That is why we are here on the floor today, subscribing ideas that provide more capital that is available.

The cost of securities regulation continues to fall heaviest on small companies. Small companies are the engine of our economy, where many of the bright people who today, by graduating from college, going to business school, learning things, they realize as they enter the marketplace, wow, there is another hurdle out there.

That is why we are here today. They want to bring their ideas to the marketplace. We are here to help them through safety and soundness, through working through the instruments of government, and to do so so that traditional financing options are available for small companies that work.

Our predatory administration—that is this Obama administration—is using Dodd-Frank as its main weapon against the free enterprise system today. This administration is using the weapons that they have available to them to stop and stifle and to make more difficult the creation of jobs, the creation of more wealth, the creation of investment, and it is all done. We see this, Mr. Speaker, when we look at GDP growth. Our country is stagnant.

Yesterday, when we were having the motion to recommit, the young gentleman from the Democratic side acknowledged most forthrightly, these are difficult financial times. All across America there are terrible financial times because of an administration that chooses to strike at the heart of the free enterprise system: the heart of the free enterprise system in health care, the heart of the free enterprise system in banking, and regulations on the energy industry, striking at the heart of people trying to get homes and keep jobs and to move things.

This administration has a constant attack against jobs, job creation, and, I believe, the American worker, yet they find it easier to give lots of money to other people but not Americans for our own job creation. That is why we are here today. But we are not going to cast this as what this is about.

What this is about is a positive effort about the American Dream, about good ideas, about bipartisanship, about following the rules to get things through a committee, to get things to the Committee on Rules, to get things on the floor, to get people to vote on a bipartisan basis.

We have, essentially, four bills in this rule, four bills that I believe are desperately—I will use that word, "desperately"—needed by small business to grow and innovate ideas. What is on the other side of that? We have already said it 10 times, the American Dream. But it is also freedom. When issuers sell securities to the public, that means more money goes into the company, money that can be used to hire more people, push a product and make it successful. That is why we are here. We are here to take the ideas, a process, in a bipartisan way.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter which addresses an issue that my dear colleague has



talked about, and that is the Zika funding issue.

The letter was written to the President of the United States on July 14, 2016, and among other things it says: "The House passed a conference report that would provide an additional \$1.1 billion in emergency supplemental funding to continue to prepare for, and prevent, Zika both domestically and internationally. It is unfortunate that Democrats have blocked action on this legislation in the Senate." Mr. Speaker, they continue to do it today.

This letter—which was signed by the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman HAL ROGERS; the gentleman THAD COCHRAN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; Chairman TOM COLE, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services; ROY BLUNT, chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services; KAY GRANGER from Fort Worth, Texas, chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations; LINDSEY GRAHAM, chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations—very clearly says: Mr. President, until that block by Senate Democrats is stopped, we give you authorization to reprogram money that would be available. You seem to find lots of money that is available to bring people to this country who might be displaced in other places around the world. Why don't you spend a little bit of money on important issues like the Zika virus?

We are on record. We are waiting for the Senate to move the bill. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know your time that you have allocated today, the precious time of this House, was done today for bills that came to us from ideas from the American people that floated on a bipartisan basis directly up to the Committee on Financial Services, which brought these bills forward. They have been talked about, marked up, and vetted. They are good to go, and I am in full support of not only this rule, but this legislation; and for that reason, I urge my colleagues to continue to support this rule and the underlying bills.

#### APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE SENDS JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE LETTER TO THE WHITE HOUSE URGING ACTION ON ZIKA FUNDING

WASHINGTON, July 14.—House Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers, along with Senate Appropriations Chairman Thad Cochran and other senior members of the House and Senate committees, today sent a joint letter to President Obama urging White House action on Zika funding.

Senate Democrats today again blocked legislation that would immediately fund efforts to prevent and fight the spread of the Zika virus. Chairmen Rogers and Cochran wrote that given the critical need for these funds and absent the funding that was blocked today, the White House should "aggressively use funds already available to mount a strong defense against the virus."

The full text of the letter is below:

President BARACK OBAMA,  
*The White House,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your Administration has asked Congress to provide additional resources to prepare for, and prevent, the spread of the Zika virus. We have responded by both supporting the reprioritization of existing resources and passing through our respective chambers legislation that would provide additional Zika response funding.

On February 18, 2016, we called upon your Administration to repurpose available funds to be spent immediately to fight the disease. On April 6, 2016, you did so through the use of existing authorities, repurposing \$589 million for Zika response activities. Given the urgency of your request, we were surprised last week when Politico reported the following based on information shared by Administration officials: "The Obama administration has so far distributed only about one-sixth of the unspent Ebola funding that it diverted to combat the Zika virus." This money is available immediately to prepare for and combat Zika, yet is seemingly not being spent.

The House passed a conference report that would provide an additional \$1.1 billion in emergency supplemental funding to continue to prepare for, and prevent, Zika both domestically and internationally. It is unfortunate that Democrats have blocked action on this legislation in the Senate. The conference report provides the same amount of funding that every Senate Democrat previously supported. It fully funds vaccine research, and increases funding for mosquito spraying and eradication, Zika surveillance, and advanced development of treatments and diagnostics. The conference agreement provides the same access to health services as your supplemental request, contains no new prohibition on any health service, and expands access to health services in Puerto Rico beyond your initial request.

If Senate Democrats continue to block consideration of Zika legislation, we urge you to aggressively use funds already available to mount a strong defense against the virus. We also note that the fiscal year 2016 appropriations bills allow the Administration access to additional funds. The Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services has transfer authority that can be used as an additional source for Zika preparedness. The previous Secretary did not hesitate to use this authority to support the failing Affordable Care Act Exchanges. The Secretary of State also has authority to reprogram funding to provide additional foreign assistance to address the Zika virus outside the United States.

We urge you to use available funding now to ensure our nation is prepared.

Sincerely,

REP. HAL ROGERS,  
*Chairman, House Appropriations Committee.*

SEN. THAD COCHRAN,  
*Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee.*

REP. TOM COLE,  
*Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services.*

SEN. ROY BLUNT,  
*Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services.*

JULY 14, 2016.

REP. KAY GRANGER,  
*Chairwoman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations.*

SEN. LINDSEY GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations.*

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 844 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said:

"The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 660.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 180, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—238

Abraham	Babin	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Allen	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Barton	Black
Amodei	Benishek	Blackburn

Blum	Hartzler	Peterson
Bost	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Boustany	Hensarling	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin
Bridenstine	Hill	Pompeo
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Posey
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Price, Tom
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe
Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Bucshon	Hultgren	Renacci
Burgess	Hunter	Ribble
Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Hurt (VA)	Rigell
Carter (GA)	Issa	Roby
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Jones	Rokita
Cole	Jordan	Rooney (FL)
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (NY)	Katko	Roskam
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Cook	King (IA)	Royce
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Russell
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Crawford	Kline	Sanford
Crenshaw	Knight	Scalise
Culberson	Labrador	Schweikert
Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Davidson	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Sessions
Denham	Lance	Shimkus
Dent	Latta	Shuster
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Long	Smith (MO)
Dold	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Donovan	Love	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Stewart
Ellmers (NC)	MacArthur	Stivers
Emmer (MN)	Marchant	Stutzman
Farenthold	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Fincher	Massie	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Tiberi
Fleischmann	McCaul	Tipton
Fleming	McClintock	Trott
Flores	McHenry	Turner
Forbes	McKinley	Upton
Fortenberry	McMorris	Valadao
Fox	Rodgers	Wagner
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Walden
Garrett	Meehan	Walker
Gibbs	Messer	Walorski
Gibson	Mica	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Gosar	Moolenaar	Westerman
Gowdy	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Granger	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Mulvaney	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Graves (MO)	Neugebauer	Woodall
Griffith	Newhouse	Yoder
Grothman	Noem	Yoho
Guinta	Nunes	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Olson	Young (IA)
Hanna	Palmer	Young (IN)
Hardy	Paulsen	Zeldin
Harper	Pearce	Zinke
Harris	Perry	

NOES—180

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Ashford	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Bass	Cicilline	Deutch
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clay	Doggett
Bera	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Beyer	Clyburn	F.
Blumenauer	Cohen	Duckworth
Bonamici	Connolly	Edwards
Boyle, Brendan	Conyers	Ellison
F.	Cooper	Engel
Brady (PA)	Costa	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Esty
Bustos	Crowley	Farr
Butterfield	Cuellar	Foster
Capps	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carney	DeFazio	Gallego
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Garamendi
Cartwright	Delaney	Graham

Grayson	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Green, Al	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Grijalva	(NM)	T.
Gutiérrez	Lynch	Sarbanes
Hahn	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Hastings	Carolyn	Schiff
Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Higgins	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Himes	McCollum	Scott, David
Hinojosa	McDermott	Serrano
Hirsh	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Honda	McNerney	Sherman
Hoyer	Meeks	Sinema
Huffman	Meng	Sires
Israel	Moore	Slaughter
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Kaptur	Napolitano	Takano
Keating	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Norcross	
Kildee	O'Rourke	
Kilmer	Pallone	
Kind	Pascarell	
Kirkpatrick	Payne	
Kuster	Pelosi	
Langevin	Perlmutter	
Larsen (WA)	Peters	
Larson (CT)	Pingree	
Lawrence	Pocan	
Lee	Polis	
Levin	Price (NC)	
Lewis	Quigley	
Lieu, Ted	Rangel	
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	
Loeback	Richmond	
Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	
Lowenthal	Ruiz	
Lowe	Ruppersberger	

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1405

Mr. WALKER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 181, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—237

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Cramer
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw
Allen	Buchanan	Culberson
Amash	Buck	Curbelo (FL)
Amodei	Bucshon	Davidson
Babin	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Barletta	Byrne	Denham
Barr	Calvert	Dent
Barton	Carter (GA)	DeSantis
Benishek	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dold
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Donovan
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Duffy
Black	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Blum	Collins (GA)	Ellmers (NC)
Bost	Collins (NY)	Emmer (MN)
Boustany	Comstock	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Conaway	Fincher
	Cook	Fitzpatrick
	Costello (PA)	Fleischmann

Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa

## NOES—181

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar

Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
McRaney  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scottenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree

Bishop (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Crawford  
DesJarlais

Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter

## NOT VOTING—13

Johnson, Sam  
Nugent  
Palazzo  
Reichert  
Ross

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF GEORGIA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 660) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of Georgia, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 6, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

## YEAS—410

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Agular  
Allen  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Baretta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishak  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boustany  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Sánchez, Loretta  
Walters, Mimi  
Westmoreland

Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clawson (FL)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxx  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Fudge  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie

Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott

McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pascarelli  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions

Sewell (AL)	Tiberi	Waters, Maxine
Sherman	Tipton	Watson Coleman
Shimkus	Titus	Weber (TX)
Shuster	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Simpson	Torres	Welch
Sinema	Trott	Wenstrup
Sires	Tsongas	Westerman
Slaughter	Turner	Williams
Smith (MO)	Upton	Wilson (FL)
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Wittman
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Womack
Speier	Veasey	Woodall
Stefanik	Vela	Yarmuth
Stewart	Velázquez	Yoder
Stivers	Visclosky	Yoho
Stutzman	Wagner	Young (AK)
Swalwell (CA)	Walden	Young (IA)
Takano	Walker	Young (IN)
Thompson (CA)	Walorski	Zeldin
Thompson (MS)	Walz	Zinke
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	
Thornberry	Schultz	

## NAYS—6

Amash	Jones	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (TX)

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA)	Huelskamp	Ross
Brown (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Sanchez, Loretta
DesJarlais	Nugent	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Gabbard	Reichert	Westmoreland

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1419

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCELERATING ACCESS TO  
CAPITAL ACT OF 2016

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2357, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 844 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2357.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1423

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, regrettably, we know that we continue to be mired in the slowest, weakest, and most tepid economic recovery in the history of the Republic, and our fellow citizens continue to suffer. The economy continues to not work for working people.

Now, we hear a lot of happy talk coming out of the administration, and they throw statistics at us telling us how happy we should be with this economy. But the economy is limping along at 1.5 to 2 percent of economic growth when the historic norm is 3.5 percent; and if you can't grow America's economy, you cannot grow the family economy.

So all this happy talk coming out of the administration, try to convince the 8 million Americans who don't have a job that this is a good economy. Try telling that to the 6 million Americans who want to work full time but only find part-time employment. Mr. Chairman, tell that to the 94 million Americans who are out of the workforce entirely. So many of them have just given up ever being able to find any type of gainful employment in this economy.

Again, it is falling so far short of its potential. All across America, American families are worrying: How are they going to pay the bills? How are they going to pay the mortgage? How are they going to be able to pay their skyrocketing healthcare premiums under ObamaCare?

We must—we must—get this economy moving again, but, Mr. Chairman, our great challenge is the job engine of America is broken, and the job engine is small business. One of the primary challenges for small business is they cannot access capital. Right now, bank lending to small businesses is at a 25-year low. Entrepreneurship, the launching of new business, and innovation, Mr. Chairman, is at a generational low. We have more small-business deaths than we do births in America today. This cannot be allowed to stand.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am so happy that today the House Financial Services Committee is putting together a package of bills that will help unleash capital for our innovators, for our entrepreneurs, and for our small businesses.

It is all part of the House Republican Better Way. We don't have to be stuck in this lackluster Obamanomics economy that is not working for working people. We can do better, and we must do better. So I am happy today that we will soon be voting on H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), who has been a real leader in access to capital.

This is a bill which simply amends a registration form with the Securities and Exchange Commission to eliminate unnecessary cost for small private companies.

This overburdensome regulation that has nothing to do with consumer protection is strangling small businesses. We need to pass this bill, again, because the cost of securities registration is falling heaviest—heaviest—on our small companies.

Another bill in this package, Mr. Chairman, is H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER). This would give really small businesses and startups more flexibility to raise funds from existing relationships without having the added cost of having to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The third bill in this package is H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act sponsored by the chairman of our Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), and it helps the bipartisan JOBS Act reach its full potential by maintaining a clear and commonsense approach to regulations for private offerings.

Again, it simply helps smaller companies raise capital. You cannot have the benefits of capitalism for American families without capital.

I commend each of my colleagues on the House Financial Services Committee for authoring these bills, for furthering these bills, and for what they will do to ensure that we can have economic growth for all, bank bailouts for none.

Now, we will soon hear from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, and if history is our guide, we will have great angst, wailing, and gnashing of teeth that somehow this is hurting consumers. Nothing—nothing—in this package does anything to detract from the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Investors Advisers Act of 1940, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, and the list goes on. Fraud is fraud. Fraud is illegal. You cannot have competitive, efficient markets with it.

□ 1430

But the SEC has a tri-part mission. Part of that mission is capital formation, and they have failed. They have failed. We must succeed on behalf of American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am going to oppose this bill because I think it rolls back too many investor protections. But I understand and appreciate the chairman's goals here. We all support the goal of increasing capital formation. We just disagree on the best way to accomplish it.

My view is that the best way to stimulate investment is to treat investors well and protect them, and that means strong investor protections. I firmly believe that markets run more, and better, on confidence than on capital.

Unfortunately, this bill goes in the wrong direction. It strips away protections that investors want in order to feel comfortable investing in startups and small companies.

I have particular concerns with title I of this bill, which would allow very small and thinly traded companies to sell securities using the faster shelf registration process. This raises serious market manipulation concerns. Let me explain why.

Shelf registration allows companies to register securities in advance and then sell them later on short notice, without getting SEC approval. Traditionally, shelf registration has been limited to larger, well-known companies, like GE or Apple, that are already widely followed by the markets, in other words, companies that investors are already very familiar with.

In 2007, the SEC decided to expand the number of companies who are eligible to use shelf registration. In doing so, however, the SEC was very careful to balance this against the need to maintain strong investor protection.

The SEC was comfortable allowing certain very small companies to have a limited ability to use shelf registration to offer securities, but only on the condition that the company have at least one class of securities listed on the exchange. This was because the exchanges have their own standards that companies must meet in order to get their securities listed on the exchange. These listing standards provide investors with sufficient assurance that the company is legitimate, has a reasonably wide investor base, and will have enough trading interest to assure a reasonable amount of liquidity in the stock.

Without the comfort provided by the exchange's initial screening procedures for these companies, however, I am not sure we should be comfortable allowing these very small companies to use shelf registration. But that is what this bill would do. It would allow very small companies that trade in over-the-counter markets to sell securities using shelf registration.

Allowing a small company, whose stock is very thinly traded to quickly sell a large amount of securities under the shelf registration raises real concerns about potential market manipulation. A company could easily bid up the price of its stock and then immediately dump a large amount of new stock to investors at the artificially inflated prices.

As Columbia Professor John Coffee noted in his testimony before the Financial Services Committee on this proposal last Congress: "Letting a small company with a modest \$50 million public float use shelf registration to attempt to sell \$150 million in securities invites potential disaster and investor confusion."

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD his entire, very critical testimony of the dangers of this legislation.

STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR JOHN C. COFFEE, JR., ADOLF A. BERLE PROFESSOR OF LAW, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, APRIL 9, 2014

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE CAPITAL FORMATION FOR SMALL AND EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES

Chairman Garrett, Ranking Member Waters, and Fellow Members of the Committee:

*Introduction*

I thank you for inviting me. I have been asked to comment on seven proposed bills, some of which appear to be a still early stage of drafting. Reasonable people can disagree about several of these provisions, but others are beyond the pale. Still, my overarching comment is that each of these bills represents a piecemeal attempt to "tweak" something in our existing system, but collectively they are uncoordinated and lack any consistent vision. If there is any common theme to these bills, it is that better integration and coordination is desirable between our twin disclosure regimes under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. That could well be true. If so, the appropriate starting point might be to mandate a study by the SEC (within, say, a realistic two-year period) of how to better coordinate both (1) these two disclosure systems, and (2) public and private offerings. Absent such an attempt at coordination, we will obtain only piecemeal (and fumbling) reforms that resemble the seven blind men groping at the elephant. In particular, as these proposals suggest, private placements may soon overtake public offerings—without adequate attention being given to the appropriate role of each.

More generally, we seem to be moving from JOBS Act I to a JOBS Act II without any serious evaluation of the impact of the first round of changes. On balance, the JOBS Act may have had only modest impact, and the proposals that are being considered today will likely have less. Because my time is limited, I will analyze these proposals in terms of the intensity of my reaction, moving from those that I feel are likely to cause real harm to those that are understandable (but that probably do not require legislation). I will 509 begin with a provision (the definition of "well-known seasoned issuer") whose impact has not been adequately or candidly explained.

1. The Definition of "Well-Known Seasoned Issuer." This may be the most radically deregulatory of the seven proposals now before this Subcommittee, but it has not been adequately explained just how far reaching this proposal would be. The proposal derives from

the 2011 Report of the SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation, where it was the 19th out of 25 recommendations made by that body. Frankly, it received only lukewarm support. The recommendation there made was to:

"Expand the availability of the special public offering provisions currently applicable only to 'well-known seasoned issuers' (WKSIs) to all public companies, including smaller reporting companies and foreign private issuers. This would permit such companies to, among other things:

a. File a universal shelf registration statement;  
b. Test the waters;  
c. Pay as you go; and  
d. Use forward incorporation by reference for Form S-1 registration statements." (Emphasis added)

Each of these "benefits" can be debated. For example, a WKSI is exempt from the "gun jumping" and "quiet period" restrictions of Section 5(c) of the Securities Act of 1933, and there can be reasonable debate about the wisdom of freeing smaller companies from these rules. Still, the key implication of expanding the definition of "well-known seasoned issuer" has not been explained: it would permit the majority of public companies to qualify for "automatic shelf registration." This may not have been the intent, but it is the consequence.

Under Rule 405, a "Well-Known Seasoned Issuer" generally qualifies for "automatic shelf registration." Since 2005, the instant that a "well-known seasoned issuer" files a registration statement, the registration statement becomes "effective" and the securities can be sold under it—without any prior SEC review. As a practical matter, allowing a company to qualify for automatic shelf registration both (1) denies the SEC's staff any opportunity to review and correct the registration statement before sales are made, and (2) makes it much more difficult for the issuer, its investment bankers, and its other agents to conduct a pre-offering "due diligence" review of the registration statement's contents (because there no longer is a pre-offering period between the filing of the registration statement and its effectiveness). Further, the SEC has a substantial staff in its Division of Corporation Finance that conducts a pre-effectiveness review of the registration statement and engages in a dialogue with the issuer. This provision short-circuits that review and largely renders them irrelevant for such issuers.

At present, a "well-known seasoned issuer" (or "WKSI" in the parlance) basically must either (i) have a "public float" of at least \$700 million (that is, the worldwide market value of its common equity, voting and nonvoting, held by non-affiliates must equal or exceed \$700 million), or (ii) have issued over the last three years \$1 billion in non-convertible debt securities. These are high standards. By some estimates, only about a third of the issuers on the NYSE meet this standard.

Under the proposed legislation, the \$700 million standard would be reduced to \$250 million. At that point, probably a majority of the issuers on both the NYSE and Nasdaq could become WKSIs—and in most cases could use "automatic shelf registration." Many of these issuers might be followed by only a single securities analyst, and do not necessarily trade in an efficient market. The SEC's staff that reviews registration statements would be unable to focus on these offerings and would be left to concentrate on IPOs and very smaller issuers. This seems a poor allocation of the SEC's resources.

Since 1933, prior review by the SEC's staff of the registration statement has been one of

the bedrock protections of our federal securities laws. Thus, I suggest to you that it is a fairly radical step to deny the SEC's staff any opportunity for a pre-offering review of the securities to be issued by most issuers. Yet, that is what this proposed expansion of the definition of WKSI does. This result may or may have been intended, but it both invites misbehavior (if an issuer knows it will not be subject to prior review) and encourages costly litigation (if errors are later discovered).

Even if this proposal were cut back so that it only permitted smaller issuers to use "universal shelf registration," I would still have some concerns. When shelf registration was first introduced in 1983, the issuer had to allocate the gross dollar value of its offering to specific types of securities (i.e., debt, equity, warrants, etc.). Then, in 1992, the SEC permitted unallocated shelf registration. In such a "universal" shelf registration, the issuer may pre-register debt, equity and other classes of securities in a single shelf registration statement without any allocation of offering amounts among these classes. In 509 1992, the SEC lowered the threshold for Form 5-3 and universal shelf registration to \$75 million (well below the \$250 level here proposed).

Thus, smaller issues can already make use of universal shelf registration. What then is achieved by expanding the definition of WKSI (other than entitling the issuer to use "automatic shelf registration")? A partial answer is that WKSI can uniquely register securities for sale for the account of selling shareholders without separately identifying "the selling security holders or the securities to be sold by such persons" until the time of the actual sale by such persons. See General Instruction ID(d) to Form 5-3. In short, by expanding the definition of WKSI, we facilitate not primary offerings by the issuer, but secondary sales by large shareholders. This does not raise capital for the issuer or create jobs, but essentially encourages a bailout by insiders. Such secondary sales, which do not have to be disclosed in the original registration statement, seem particularly problematic in the case of smaller companies.

To sum up, this provision is not what it seems. It does not simplify the issuer's access to capital, but it does both (i) strip the SEC of its pre-offering review authority, and (ii) facilitate secondary bailouts by insiders.

2. HR 2659 ("Accelerated Filer"). This provision would modify the definition of "accelerated filer" in SEC Rule 12b-2 (17 C.F.R. 240.12b-2), which today makes an issuer an "accelerated filer" if it has a "public float" of between \$75 million and \$700 million (that is, the value of its equity shares not held by affiliates). Under the proposed revision, the new test would be moved up to \$250 million (instead of \$75 million), and in addition the issuer would need to have "annual revenues of greater than \$100,000,000 during the most recently completed fiscal year for which audited financial statements are available" (see Section 2 of H.R. 2629). Thus, many issuers today deemed accelerated filers would escape that label under this revised test, including some with very large market capitalizations.

What is the consequence of this change? First, it will allow many companies to escape Section 404(b) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and its requirement of an annual audit of internal controls. The JOBS Act already did this with respect to "emerging growth companies" (at least for a five-year "on ramp"), but this provision would exempt older companies that did not qualify for that exemption. Also, the exemption could continue forever and not just for five years. Second, under the instructions to Form 10-Q, an

"accelerated filer" must file its Form 10-Q within 40 days after the end of the fiscal quarter, whereas all other issuers must file within 45 days after the end of the quarter. This is a further small step away from transparency.

If the goal is to cut back further on the scope of Section 404(b), this might best be done directly without causing any other collateral consequences. Still, some estimate should be made of just how many companies will escape Section 404(b) by this back door. Finally, the JOBS Act had a stronger rationale for its Section 404(b) exemption, (namely, that it permitted a temporary accommodation for young and emerging companies), whereas this bill's exemption covers old companies and potentially forever.

3. Raising the Disclosure Exemption Under Rule 701(e) from \$5 million to \$20 million. Currently, Rule 701 exempts from registration sales by non-reporting issuers of their securities to employees, consultants and advisors (and their family members) pursuant to a written compensatory benefit plan or compensatory contract. Effectively, this rule shelters non-reporting companies from the potentially expensive obligation to register stock options and similar equity compensation under the Securities Act of 1933. But under Rule 701(e), some minimal disclosure is required, including financial statements and "information about the risks associated with investment in the securities." This limited obligation to provide such information is not applicable if the issuer sells less than \$5 million of its securities under this exemption during any consecutive 12-month period. The proposed bill before this Committee would raise this \$5 million level to \$20 million.

Because the disclosure obligation under Rule 701 is minimal and does not require the preparation of any formal disclosure document, this proposal to raise the exemption by 400% to \$20 million seems hard to justify. First, there is no rationale advanced for the \$20 million threshold. Second, there is little hardship or burden in giving your financial statements to your own employees. This proposal did not even seem to win substantial support within the small business community (as it has not been regularly cited at the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation).

Further, once the volume of sales under Rule 701 exceeds \$5 million and begins to approach \$20 million, the cost of providing minimal disclosure falls as a percentage of the total transaction. It may seem a nuisance to an issuer to provide disclosure when its Rule 701 sales are minimal, but if the sales fall into the \$5 to \$20 million range, this is a major (and probably recurring) activity for the issuer.

4. Expanding the Availability of Form S-3. Today, eligibility for use of Form S-3 (and thus the ability to use shelf-registration) generally requires that an issuer have a "public float" of at least \$75 million. See General Instruction IB(1) to Form S-3. In addition, other registrants can use Form S-3 if (i) the aggregate market value of securities sold by the registrant during the period of 12 calendar months immediately preceding and including the sale does not exceed one-third of its public float (i.e., the aggregate market value of its common equity held by non-affiliates—see General Instruction IB(6)(a) to Form S-3), (ii) the issuer is not a "shell company," and (iii) the registrant has at least one class of common equity registered on a national securities exchange (General Instruction IB(6)(c) to Form S-3). In effect, this alternative test allows listed companies with less than a \$75 million public float to use Form S-3, but places a ceiling on the size of the offerings that they may do using Form

S-3 that is equal to one-third of their public float. Letting a small company with a modest \$50 million public float use shelf registration to attempt to sell \$150 million in securities invites potential disaster and investor confusion.

Nonetheless, a bill before this Committee, known as the "Small Company Freedom to Grow Act of 2014" would permit this by eliminating most of these limitations. Effectively, it would allow any company, which is not a "shell company" (as defined in Rule 405) and that has not been a "shell company" for at least 12 calendar months, to use Form S-3. Under this provision, even microcap companies could thus use shelf registration and offer securities from time to time in any amount, at least if they were reporting companies and were current in their 1934 filings (to thereby satisfy General Instruction IA).

This would represent a significant change in long-standing SEC policy, and I suggest that Committee consult the SEC to hear its view. Traditionally, shelf registration was limited to seasoned issuers with a sizable market capitalization and an established market following. Under this provision, even companies traded only on the Pink Sheets or the OTC Bulletin Board might use shelf registration and make a sizable offering with no prior notice. As a practical matter, I doubt that the market will accept such offerings or that reputable underwriters will feel comfortable with them, but the door is at least opened (and in a frothy market, anything can happen and has).

5. Blue Sky Preemption. The above-noted "Small Company Freedom to Grow Act of 2014" would also preempt state "Blue Sky" laws in the case of "smaller reporting companies" and "emerging growth companies." Currently, Section 18 of the Securities Act preempts only "nationally traded securities" that are either (i) listed on certain national securities exchanges (under SEC rules that look to their listing standards), or (ii) are issued in certain exempt transactions involving qualified purchasers. This proposal would extend the scope of Section 18's preemption of state blue sky law by an order of magnitude. Potentially, companies traded on the Pink Sheets (or not even traded at all) would be exempted if the issuer was a reporting company.

This makes little sense at a time when the SEC is resource-constrained and cannot Challenge every transaction. The cases most likely to sneak under the SEC's radar screen are precisely those involving local or regional companies that are traded over-the-counter, on the OTC Bulletin Board, or on the Pink Sheets. Unfortunately, these are exactly the low visibility companies that this statute would exempt from the scrutiny of state regulators.

Perhaps, the sponsors of this bill see state "Blue Sky" regulators as difficult, overly suspicious, bureaucratic, or prone to delay. I believe such a characterization is unfair. State regulators are hard-working, have more than enough to do, and typically focus their attention on precisely those smaller companies that the SEC is most likely to overlook. Preempting state law simply because an issuer files reports with the SEC places excessive reliance on the SEC and invites fraud and misconduct.

6. Form S-1 and Forward Integration. For some time, the SEC's Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation has called for changes to permit smaller reporting companies that have filed a Form S-1 to incorporate by reference documents filed with the SEC. Effectively, this would make the Form S-1 "evergreen" in the sense that it would not become stale. Of the various proposals before this Committee, I believe this one does have real efficiency justifications and could help smaller issuers.



Again, I believe the Committee should seek the views of the SEC on this matter, and I do not suggest that Form S-1 should be expanded to become a vehicle for shelf registration (which should instead require that the issuers qualify for the use of Form S-3). But I do see merit in this proposal.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I share Professor Coffee's concerns about this proposal.

I also oppose title II of this bill, which would create another exemption for the securities law for certain microcap offerings of less than \$500,000.

Unfortunately, history has proven that there is a good deal of petty fraud in microcap offerings. So ensuring that there is proper oversight of microcap offerings—ideally, by State securities regulators—is important if your goal is to protect retail investors from fraud.

Finally, title III of the bill would strip away even the most modest investor protections that the SEC has proposed for unregistered, private securities. It is important to note that we are already seeing a trend toward much greater use of unregistered, private securities rather than publicly registered securities. In fact, the private securities market is now larger than the public securities market. In 2014, companies raised \$2.1 trillion through the private securities market compared to only \$1.35 trillion through the public securities market.

What this means is that more securities are being sold with fewer investor protections. Title III of this bill would take away yet another investor protection by allowing companies to sell unregistered, private securities without having to file any information with the SEC first.

I think this bill goes in the wrong direction. We should be talking about strengthening investor protections, not weakening them.

I would also like to note that President Obama has issued a veto threat on this bill and states that all three titles are dangerous for investors. He states that markets function more efficiently when they are transparent, well regulated, and trusted by investors and insurers alike.

These bills would reduce transparency, inhibit effective regulatory oversight of our capital markets by the SEC, and would undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD this veto.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2357—ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL ACT OF 2016—REP. WAGNER, R-MO)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. The Rules Committee Print of H.R. 2357 contains the text of H.R. 2357 as reported (Title I), as well as texts of H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, as reported (Title II), and H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act, as reported (Title III). Markets function most efficiently when they are transparent, well-regulated, and trusted by investors and issuers alike. These bills would

reduce transparency and inhibit effective regulatory oversight of our capital markets by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). These bills would undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote.

H.R. 2357 (Title I) would weaken investor protections by reducing the quality or availability of information needed to make informed investment decisions. By compelling the SEC to amend Form S-3, the bill would: (1) allow microcap companies traded on an exchange to issue an unlimited number of shares using shelf registration within a 12-month period; and (2) permit unlisted microcap companies, including those listed on the "pink sheets," with less than \$75 million in common equity to sell up to 1/3 of the market value of their common equity using shelf registration in a 12-month period. This bill would harm investors by reducing disclosure requirements and infringe on the SEC's ability to appropriately respond to market developments. Such changes would increase the risks posed by accounting fraud, market manipulation, insider trading, and the sale of artificially-inflated stock.

H.R. 4850 (Title II) would similarly undermine investor protections and the integrity of capital formation for small businesses. Specifically, the bill eliminates all existing investor protections for crowdfunding and Regulation A offerings, provided that the securities: (1) are sold to purchasers with a substantive pre-existing relationship with individuals affiliated with the company, including controlling investors; (2) involve 35 or fewer purchasers; (3) do not exceed more than \$500,000, annually; and (4) do not involve a person who has violated the securities laws. These criteria do not negate the need for consumer protections embedded in current regulations.

This legislation would create yet another unnecessary and unwarranted exemption from the Securities Act of 1933 to enable the sale of microcap offerings (those involving sales of securities valued at \$500,000 or less in a single year) without appropriate regulatory protections. While the legislation would limit the total number of investors in such offerings, it lacks a requirement that those investors have the financial sophistication to understand potential risks of the offering or the financial means to withstand losses. It requires only that they have a "preexisting relationship" with an officer, director, or major shareholder of the issuer, a condition that provides no meaningful protections.

Finally, H.R. 4852 (Title III) runs counter to SEC efforts to enhance disclosure requirements, limiting the SEC's ability to finalize previously proposed investor protections, and would weaken other key consumer protections and provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Additionally, H.R. 4852 bars the SEC from taking appropriate actions to provide needed oversight of the financial markets, encourages widespread non-compliance with existing SEC filing requirements, and undermines the SEC's informed policymaking.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2357, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I would just like to close by reminding our colleagues on both sides of the aisle why these investor protections were put in place. We still have not recovered from the 2008 crisis where literally millions of Americans lost their homes, lost their jobs,

and, depending on which economist you listen to, \$15 to \$18 trillion of wealth in this country lost and down the drain.

I just came from a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee where testimony included a statement that this was the first financial crisis in the history of our country that could have been prevented by better regulation and oversight of our markets. I do not understand why anyone in this body would want to support rolling back investor protections. This merely keeps in place protections that have worked well for this country and for investors.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

I am proud to sponsor the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, H.R. 2357. I would also like to thank and congratulate my colleagues, Representative EMMER and Chairman GARRETT, for their legislation as well.

Regulatory burden is one of the reasons why we are still in the slowest recovery of our lifetime since the financial crisis. Small businesses are finding it more and more difficult to find financing in order to grow and expand their business.

Dodd-Frank has made traditional bank lending for small businesses more scarce. Smaller companies that wish to go to the capital markets are finding compliance and regulatory requirements too extensive and far too costly.

This legislation builds upon other efforts by this committee to provide simplified disclosure and reduce burdens for smaller companies in order to lower the cost of raising capital.

Specifically, this would extend to smaller reporting companies the ability to utilize Form S-3, a much more simplified registration for companies that have already met prior reporting requirements with the SEC. Allowing small companies to use this form would provide significant benefits with its shorter length, allowing forward incorporation by reference and the ability to offer securities off the shelf, which are all things that larger companies are currently able to enjoy.

Streamlining disclosure will lower compliance costs associated with filing redundant paperwork, which will in turn allow companies to direct more resources to growing their business. Fuel Performance Solutions, which is a fantastic company based in my hometown of St. Louis, has spent the last 10 years working on exciting fuel products that could potentially save Americans money at the pump and reduce harmful emissions.

In order to fund this research in breakthrough technology, Fuel Performance Solutions eventually decided

to register with the SEC and go public to raise more capital and expand their business.

The company conducted a study, Mr. Chair, and found that, instead of filling out a 100-page registration form which takes about 4 to 6 weeks to complete, this legislation would allow them to fill out a 20-page form which only takes 2 days to complete. As a result, they would have incurred less legal fees, less accounting, and less investment banking fees and saved close to \$225,000.

Additionally, under this job growth legislation, they could have received SEC approval in days, rather than months, and thereby obtain certainty in regard to funding their business.

I am proud that the greater Metropolitan St. Louis region is the fastest growing startup scene in the country. But we must provide opportunities for these businesses and many others to grow and drive and thrive in the marketplace.

Extending these cost-saving provisions to smaller companies that large companies are currently able to enjoy is absolutely critical and can make the difference in their ability to issue an additional offering, expand their business, and create more jobs. The Accelerating Access to Capital Act will do just that.

I urge the passage of this legislation. Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

Mr. Chair, 7 weeks ago, the Republican majority recessed the House for the summer district work period—7 weeks. Seven weeks is a long time, time that we in Congress could have spent addressing the many pressing issues that are facing the country right now.

The 7 weeks did, however, provide me and my colleagues an opportunity to go back to our districts, meet with our constituents, and learn about what their priorities are, what the priorities are that the American people have for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

I, for one, heard from my constituents on a number of things. They are concerned about the arrival of Zika in the United States, and they want a more comprehensive Federal response to that outbreak.

□ 1445

They were shocked by the devastation in Flint, Michigan, and worried about their own water quality.

They were bewildered that the gun lobby continues to block sensible gun safety reforms in the face of increasingly routine mass shootings and senseless gun violence on our streets.

Incredibly now, Mr. Chairman, we have returned; and what are we doing in our first days? What are we doing? What are some of the first things that

we are bringing up in spite of what the public has said its priorities are?

Yet again, we are voting on a bill that is designed to roll back the important oversight of our financial markets and to eliminate critical consumer protections that guard against unscrupulous securities sales. This bill, H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act—or, as I call it, the “Wolf of Wall Street Enhancement Act”—would jump-start fraud in our capital markets. Each of the bill’s three titles would reduce transparency, weaken consumer disclosure, and fuel fraud in our financial markets.

I want to ask my colleagues: Who are the people out there who are asking for these changes in our securities law? Did anyone hear in a town hall that they did? Did anyone hear at those meetings this summer about the need to expand shelf registration for unproven companies? Who back home is clamoring for unregistered, undisclosed security offerings? Who wants to further tie the hands of the SEC’s in adopting even the most modest disclosure requirements?

Yet again, Congress’ agenda has been warped by the undue influence of narrow special interests. Yet again, we are ignoring the real priorities of the American people. Mr. Chairman, we have more important business than this. I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader and the leader of our Innovation Initiative.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, innovation is the key to America’s future. With it, America can continue to be the economic and cultural leader of the world while providing important and good-paying jobs here at home. With it, our government can spend more time and money in helping Americans who need it and less in supporting a wasteful, ineffective, and outdated bureaucracy. I have seen firsthand the power of innovation in America, and it is not just in Silicon Valley. Centers of innovation are growing across our country and are bringing with them new opportunities and second chances.

I recently visited a company called ZeroFOX in south Baltimore. They provide social media security and they gather intelligence on the threats that are facing employees, businesses, and other organizations online. ZeroFOX is a bright spot in a city, like so many others in America, that was hit hard by a recession but that was struggling long before then. These communities were centers of industry—they manufactured and thousands were employed. Then some companies closed up shop; manufacturing declined; and people lost their livelihoods.

But America is not a story of decline. Even today, you can see communities rising again, not by trying to recreate

the past, but by looking to the future. New centers of innovation from south Baltimore to San Antonio and from North Carolina to Louisiana are spreading across America and are bringing with them new economic activity, new construction, new jobs, and, especially, new hope. That is what our country needs. That is what working people across America need.

The package of bills we have before us today is part of the Innovation Initiative—our legislative project to bring innovation into government and to allow innovation to thrive in the private sector. What this package of bills does is to help innovators gain access to capital. You can ask any business owner or dreamer out there. They know that ideas and work ethic are fundamental but that it takes capital to be able to make those ideas a reality—to make even more success stories in communities across our country like in south Baltimore.

I thank those Members who worked on these bills: ANN WAGNER, TOM EMMER, SCOTT GARRETT, and, especially, Chairman JEB HENSARLING. We need more practical solutions like these to create new opportunities for the American people, not in theory, but in their everyday lives.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am really underscoring that my colleagues should vote against this bill because it rolls back investor protections.

Why in the world do we want to roll back investor protections?

We have heard some of my Republican colleagues suggest that, because the bill does not alter the securities laws regarding fraud, it has no bearing on fraud and will only help small businesses. This is wrong for a number of reasons. Let me try to explain this with a real life example.

Robbie Dale Walker was a former police officer who was living with his mother in Dripping Springs, Texas. Mr. Walker approached his mother’s best friend, Dolores “Pokey” Conn, and offered to sell her an investment in an oil and gas drilling program. Mrs. Conn was a 96-year-old widow at the time of the solicitation. After gaining her trust, Mr. Walker sold Mrs. Conn an investment of \$100,000 in an oil and gas drilling program. Later, he convinced her to invest another \$100,000. Mr. Walker convinced two other individuals to invest an additional \$55,000.

In this case and in similar instances, State securities regulators often get calls asking whether an issuer or a dealer is selling legitimate securities. If the securities are not registered and have not filed a Form D with the SEC, the State securities regulators can warn investors about a potential red flag. In addition, the regulators’ enforcement divisions can open investigations into the matters.

If title II of H.R. 2357 is enacted, the Texas regulator in this case would not

be able to quickly provide a red flag to a concerned investor like Mrs. Conn because Mr. Walker would not have to provide any disclosures to investors or regulators.

Although I don't doubt that the Texas regulator eventually would have caught Mr. Walker, the most likely outcome would have been that he and fraudsters like him would have been able to have run their schemes for several more years, further defrauding other seniors like Mrs. Conn. Today, Mr. Walker is serving a 25-year prison sentence for this fraud, and Congress should not be making it easier for the next Mr. Walker to defraud another grandmother.

Again, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say, with regard to the gentlewoman's anecdote, if the gentleman engaged in fraud, apparently, he went to prison. Fraud is against the law, and people who perpetrate it should be in prison. Apparently, they are, and nothing in this bill changes that.

I was also struck by the previous speaker from the Democratic side who cited all of these constituent priorities and who didn't once mention the plight of middle-income workers, who are falling behind, whose paychecks are stagnant, and whose savings have been decimated. The National Small Business Association has found that 20 percent of small businesses had to reduce the number of employees as a result of tight credit. That is why we are working to get access to capital for small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee, and who also happens to be the author of H.R. 4852, the Private Placement Improvement Act.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2015.

I also want to thank Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and all of my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee who have continued to support legislation that will allow our economy to grow and to expand opportunities for all Americans across this country.

Mr. Chairman, as I spend time with my constituents in the Fifth District, the message I hear from them is largely the same one I have been hearing for the last 8 years. People are concerned about jobs. They are concerned about their economic security and retirements. Perhaps, most importantly, they are concerned about whether their kids—their children—are going to have the same kinds of opportunities that they have enjoyed.

You see, there is no more ambiguity remaining about the economic legacy

of the Obama administration. Last month's news that the economy grew at an abysmal 1.1 percent during the second quarter merely confirms what we already knew: we are mired in the weakest economic recovery since World War II. Some economists now think we are heading into another recession. It appears that all of the promises that came with the passage of Dodd-Frank, ObamaCare, the \$800 billion stimulus package, and the thousands of regulations in the last 8 years were just that: promises.

Fortunately, for the last 5 years, the Financial Services Committee has been an oasis in a desert of bad ideas. Our committee has been at the forefront of putting forth job-creating, bipartisan legislation—most notably, the JOBS Act of 2012, as well as a number of other important measures that were signed into law in 2015.

Here we have H.R. 2357. It is a compilation of bills, if you will, that have passed our committee and would help empower entrepreneurs and small businesses, not bureaucrats and Washington insiders.

First, we have Mrs. WAGNER's bill, which would expand the number of companies that could take advantage of the short form registration. Allowing more companies to use the form would significantly reduce paperwork and man-hours. As she has indicated, last year, it would have saved 70,000 man-hours and over \$84 million in compliance costs. Allowing expanded use has been a frequent recommendation of something called the SEC's Government-Businesses Forum on Small Business Capital Formation; but it is not surprising that the SEC has ignored those ideas year, after year, after year.

H.R. 2357 also includes Mr. EMMER's ideas, under the Securities Act of 1933, to allow the so-called micro offerings. What this means in layman's terms is that a business would be allowed to stand up before a local Chamber of Commerce or Kiwanis Club and solicit an investment without running afoul of all of the securities laws. This really is an innovative idea, and it requires Congress to step in and facilitate it.

Finally, you have mine. You have the Private Placement Improvement Act, which I authored. This is part of the package, and it would prohibit the SEC from implementing onerous, new regulations or requirements on companies that raise capital—how?—through private channels that they proposed back in 2013. As several experts have testified before our committee, the mere existence of these amendments by the SEC is preventing more job creation.

Taken together, finally, Mr. Chairman, all of these bills continue the good work of the Financial Services Committee, under our chairman, JEB HENSARLING, over the last 5 years, to bring our capital markets into the 21st century and create opportunities for American businesses and their families.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee in that the point of these investor protections is to enable regulators to stop the abusive practices and fraud, as was being perpetrated on the friend of Mr. Walker's mother. Because they had disclosure requirements and he had not disclosed or filed with the SEC, they knew it was a fraud securities and were able to intercede and stop the fraud and arrest Mr. Walker.

I feel that these rollbacks are really very dangerous to investors, and I cannot understand why anyone would want to make it easier for a "Mr. Walker" to defraud grandmothers in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member.

□ 1500

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate Congresswoman MALONEY holding down the fort while I was away today, and I appreciate the work that she has put in this committee on these issues. I am very pleased to be here with her today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2357, a toxic package of bills that would outright encourage fraud in our financial markets and put retail investors and small businesses at risk. Instead of addressing a host of critical issues facing the American people, including helping the people of Baton Rouge, for example, where there has been a loss of 160,000 homes, instead of helping to come together with this side of the aisle to deal with Zika, instead of helping to deal with the problem we have of water up in Flint, or dealing with the idea that we need to expand Social Security, here we are.

Those people in Baton Rouge, who have just suffered all these devastating losses following the historic flooding last month, are looking to us for help and support. Here we are under the leadership of our Republicans prioritizing a bill that would make it easier for companies to scam investors by escaping regulatory scrutiny.

In particular, H.R. 2357 would allow small companies that are not listed on a national stock exchange to publicly offer their stock as an accelerated filer, without first alerting the Securities and Exchange Commission or gaining its approval.

Currently, this accelerated filer status is reserved for larger companies that meet the standards of and are traded on a national stock exchange. They also are closely followed by analysts, giving investors more insight into their activities. Small companies traded off exchange simply don't have the same safeguards in place.

Providing this type of quick access to our securities markets without sufficient oversight and transparency would

lead to accounting fraud, market manipulation, insider trading, and sales of unofficially inflated stock. Anyone who has seen the movie, "The Wolf of Wall Street," can tell you just how bad this would be for our investors and their savings.

Next, the bill would recreate a private securities offering that would be exempt from Federal and State securities laws. The bill would carve out a scenario where a private company could sell stock to certain investors without providing them or the SEC with any information. This stock could then be distributed to the public at large without restriction and, again, without any information.

What is more troubling is that the SEC previously eliminated this exact type of offering exemption after concluding that it, in fact, facilitated fraud. Specifically, the exemption had been used frequently in fraudulent pump-and-dump schemes where these early investors aggressively promoted the stock to artificially inflate its price and then dump their shares on unsuspecting investors.

The provision also ignores the fact that the JOBS Act created similar, yet responsible, exemptions to facilitate small company offerings under the crowdfunding rules in regulation A. As a result, this bill would simply create a big loophole for companies to secretly conduct public offerings and swindle investors.

Lastly, the bill would stop the SEC dead in its tracks in advancing important investor protections in the trillion-dollar private securities market. In particular, it would block the Commission from requiring companies to file a short, simple notice of a sale to alert the SEC and State regulators to possible fraud.

It also would prevent the SEC from stopping private equity funds and hedge funds from using misleading advertising materials. This would essentially allow bad actors to run wild and sell stock to unknowing investors about their true intentions.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this bill represents reckless shortsightedness and woeful disregard for the history of fraud in the securities market by undoing much-needed disclosure requirements and investor protections. The administration has threatened to veto this bill saying it would "undermine not only the health and integrity of our markets, but the very capital formation process they claim to promote."

I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to join me, investor advocates, and State securities regulators in opposing H.R. 2357.

I close by raising the questions: Why is it, coming back from break, with all of these important issues facing the American public, do we move so quickly to protect Wall Street, to protect private equity, to protect hedge funds? Who are we looking out for in the Congress of the United States of America?

Do we have to go back and remind people what happened in this country in 2008 when we put so many families and communities at risk because we didn't have the oversight, we didn't have the transparency, we didn't have the watchful eye of the cop on the block really doing the work we needed to protect our investors and our citizens? Why are we doing this? Why are we spending this time?

I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me and vote against this bill and send a message to our citizens and our constituencies that we are on the side of Main Street, not Wall Street.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to answer the ranking member's question. We are here because we care about the plight of the working poor. We care about the fact that middle-income families are falling behind. The other side of the aisle has had 8 years of their economics, and we don't have a healthy economy. So we are growing the economy through this bill, and that is why it is so vitally important.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, I think it is the first time since coming here as a Member of Congress that I have heard a Hollywood film cited as an authority. If I recall the film, the guy went to jail, as he well should have.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the author of H.R. 4850, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act which would give our very small businesses and startups more flexibility to raise funds and create jobs for a better economy.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, with real unemployment at almost 10 percent, labor force participation at an all-time low, and a mere 1 percent economic growth last quarter, it is clear that the American economy is just not working.

Contributing to the problems are the regulatory burdens caused by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act, which has reduced the number of credit unions and community banks in my State of Minnesota by nearly 25 percent over the past 6 years.

Because of this, it is increasingly difficult for entrepreneurs to find the capital they need to start a new business or expand an existing one. In fact, today there are 3 million fewer small business loans made annually than prior to the 2008 crisis.

This is particularly alarming because small business creates roughly 70 percent of the new jobs. And today's small businesses, as we all know, are tomorrow's Fortune 500 companies. Just think of all the great businesses in this country that started with a dream in a garage: Amazon, Apple, Microsoft, Disney, Harley Davidson, and Minnesota's own Medtronic.

I fear that with our current lack of access to capital, many of them would not have gotten off the ground today. Who knows what future American success story we may not be able to witness due to these issues. In fact, ac-

cording to the Kauffman Index, a measure that tracks business startups in each State, America has dropped from prerecession highs when it comes to starting new businesses.

Our legislation, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, which is included in this proposal before us, will fix the access to capital problem that is limiting sustainable growth in our communities. It will make it easier for entrepreneurs to borrow money from their friends and family. Minnesotans will be able to launch their business ideas and encourage the creation of jobs, wealth, and opportunity for everyone.

Specifically, this legislation allows Americans to do a private security offering, free from any hoops to jump through by the SEC if they meet these three simple criteria: the investor has a substantive preexisting relationship with the owner; there are fewer than 35 investors; and the aggregate amount from all investors is no more than \$500,000.

Not only will this help Americans, but the other two bills we are considering today are equally important. The Accelerating Access to Capital Act will make it easier for certain companies to register securities, and the Private Placement Improvement Act will make it less complicated to issue securities under regulation D.

Together, these bills will generate economic prosperity, boost wages, and help Americans from all walks of life find good paying and rewarding jobs.

I want to thank Congresswoman WAGNER, Congressman GARRETT, and Chairman HENSARLING for their leadership on these issues.

I urge all of my colleagues to support these proposals.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to underscore that this bill is bad for investors, bad for the financial industry, and bad for our country. It moves us in the wrong direction. It treats investors terribly. They were treated awfully in the financial crisis where millions lost their jobs, millions lost their homes, and well over \$15 trillion of private money evaporated from the economy of this great country.

Now, investor protections are there to protect investors. I cannot understand any valid reason why anyone would want to roll back protections, some of which have been on the books since the Great Depression.

Again, I urge a "no" vote on it.

I would like to inform the chairman of the Financial Services Committee that I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the House Small Business Committee who knows how desperately these bills are needed to aid our small business growth.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act of

2015. I especially want to voice my strong support for the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, which is now an integral part of this bill and which I was happy to cosponsor when it was first introduced.

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and all of the folks on the Financial Services Committee for working on behalf of small businesses all across the country. I happen to chair the House Small Business Committee, as was mentioned.

Small businesses are hurting across America. There is no question about that. Access to capital is a critical issue for America's 28 million small businesses.

At the Small Business Committee, we like to acknowledge that every small business started with an idea. Those ideas can become jobs. In fact, those ideas create about 7 out of every 10 new jobs created in this country every year, but access to capital is the key ingredient.

A lot of our existing laws and far too many Federal regulations make access to capital harder for small business. It is harder for them than it is for larger companies, larger corporations, and hedge funds. H.R. 2357 takes an important step in addressing this problem. By clarifying the law in a way that allows small businesses to raise capital through limited, smaller scale, non-public offerings, we are cutting through the red tape that has kept far too many new investors just out of reach from a lot of our small businesses.

□ 1515

This legislation also addresses the unfair share of the Federal regulatory burden that our small businesses carry. At the Committee on Small Business, we hear countless examples of businesses that have to decide between meeting regulatory costs and meeting their payroll, and that affects many, many families, American families all across the country that depend on these small businesses.

That is what happens when regulators don't consider the impact of what they are imposing on businesses of every size. A regulation that might be workable for a large company can prove devastating for a small business. The Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act, which the House passed last year, addresses this problem. Today's legislation also fully recognizes that the Federal Government's regulatory approach cannot be a one-size-fits-all, especially where small businesses are concerned, and that is why I am here to support it.

I again want to thank Mr. HENSARLING and all the folks on the Committee on Financial Services for their hard work in this area. We have to do something about helping small businesses all across the country. The regulatory burdens that come out of this city, out of Washington, D.C., are killing companies all across America.

They are killing jobs. Thank you very much for working hard on this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), vice chairman of our Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. Like many of us here, when I first ran for Congress, I ran because I believed that Washington had become too far removed from the people it is supposed to represent. I was concerned then, as I am today, that Washington's policies are negatively impacting Fifth District Virginians and the future for our children and grandchildren.

I represent a sweeping district along the Blue Ridge Mountains that spreads from Fauquier County south to the North Carolina border. Within our district, there are few areas with robust economic activity. In fact, most of our district is comprised of rural countryside and Main Street courthouse towns. Unfortunately, much of our district has suffered devastating unemployment, at times reaching double digits. That is why I am pleased with the work that we have done on the Committee on Financial Services under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING, as it has a real impact on the economic growth of our small companies and their access to our capital markets. Our Nation's small businesses are our most dynamic job creators, and helping them grow and expand ultimately creates jobs.

This bill is not about Wall Street. This bill is, indeed, about Main Street. H.R. 2357 is comprised of three titles, the first being authored by Representative WAGNER. This measure would amend the Securities and Exchange Commission's Form S-3 registration statement to expand eligibility to small reporting companies. The cost of securities regulation falls heaviest upon smaller companies, and title I eliminates unnecessary costs by expanding the use of Form S-3 to smaller reporting companies. This would lower compliance costs and would not eliminate the SEC's ability to bring enforcement actions. Every one of the investor protection provisions in Federal securities laws would remain unchanged.

Title II of the legislation is Mr. EMMER's Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. This measure would amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide an exemption for small, private offerings of securities known as micro offerings. For this exemption to apply, each investor has to have a preexisting relationship with the owner, there must be 35 or fewer purchasers, and the amount cannot exceed \$500,000. Again, the SEC still has the authority to bring enforcement actions, and every investor pro-

tection provision in the Federal securities laws remains intact.

Finally, title III, Mr. GARRETT's Private Placement Improvement Act, would direct the SEC to revise reg D to eliminate the SEC's harmful proposed rule that is hindering small businesses' ability to raise cash. As we all recall, the purpose of the bipartisan JOBS Act we passed in 2012 was to make it easier for startups to market their securities; but when the SEC implemented the new law, the SEC proposed a separate rule that would impose new regulatory requirements on small companies seeking to use the rule 506 to raise capital. This is not consistent with Congress' intent, and now companies seeking to raise capital using rule 506 would be required to submit additional form D filings on an ongoing basis. The SEC has not acted on this proposed rule, which is why it is incumbent upon Congress to prevent it from doing so.

In closing, the SEC has the responsibility to facilitate capital formation while remaining true to its duty to protect investors. The legislative package before this body today is about ensuring that our Nation's small businesses are in the best position possible to do what they do best: to innovate, grow their businesses, and create jobs. These commonsense proposals will help them do just that.

I urge my colleagues to support this good bill, and I thank the chairman for the time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the North American Securities Administrators Association, where they come out strongly against this bill. They say that it shifts "policies in the wrong direction, weakening the oversight of our capital markets and placing retail investors needlessly at risk."

NORTH AMERICAN SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Washington, DC, September 8, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Re H.R. 2357—Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA), I write to express strong concern regarding H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, which may be considered by the House of Representatives this week. State securities regulators have taken steps to help expand opportunities for small businesses to access investment capital including implementation of intrastate crowdfunding regimes and support of the SEC's recent proposal to modernize Rule 147 and increase the offering limits of Rule 504. We are, however, very concerned that the provisions of the H.R. 2357 that are discussed below would shift policies in the wrong direction, weakening oversight of our capital markets and placing retail investors needlessly at risk.

## SECTION 2: (THE MICRO-OFFERING SAFE HARBOR ACT OF 2016)

Section 2 of the Accelerating Access to Capital Act would amend Section 4 of the Securities Act to create a new transactional exemption from registration for certain securities offerings, including offers to retail investors. As presently constituted, the bill would permit the offering of private or unregistered securities to an unlimited number of unaccredited investors that may lack financial sophistication or wherewithal. For reasons that NASAA has already discussed extensively in comments to the Financial Services Committee regarding this legislation, state securities regulators continue to question the practical necessity of this proposed exemption and the nature of the issuers it is intended to serve. We note that there are already several provisions at the state and federal level that small, microcap issuers can rely upon for limited offerings to unaccredited investors, including intrastate crowdfunding and other limited offering exemptions.

Further, Section 2 would preempt state authority to review securities offerings that are by their nature local, state-based offerings. Preemption for this type of localized offering is inconsistent with investor protections afforded by state review, and would handcuff the regulators best positioned to regulate the marketplace for these offerings.

## SECTION 3: (THE PRIVATE PLACEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016)

Section 3 of H.R. 2357 would prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") from adopting proposed rules to implement common-sense reforms for Regulation D, Rule 506 offerings.

Title II of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups ("JOBS") Act repealed the long-established prohibition on general solicitation and advertising of securities under Rule 506. When the SEC adopted rules to implement Title II, on July 10, 2013, it also voted to propose rules that could mitigate the risk to ordinary investors from 506 offerings, including by requiring a pre-filing of "Form D" when issuers intend to advertise Rule 506 securities to the general public, and by imposing meaningful penalties on issuers who fail to file a Form D. Section 3 of H.R. 2357 would effectively prohibit the SEC from adopting these rules.

State securities regulators, pursuant to their antifraud authority, are the primary regulators of offerings under Regulation D, Rule 506, and fraudulent offerings involving Rule 506 offerings are routinely among the most frequent violations reported by state securities regulators. The SEC's proposal to require the timely filing of Form D and establish consequences for issuers who fail to file a Form D when conducting a Regulation D, Rule 506 offering, is a common-sense step that is long overdue.

Form D is a short form that captures basic information about the issuer including the issuer's business address, officers, directors, business type, and minimal information about the securities being offered. The information contained in a Form D is crucial to state securities regulators, who regularly encourage investors to "investigate before you invest." When investors contact their state regulators, particularly after learning about an offering through an advertisement or solicitation, Form D is often the only information available about an issuer when an investor calls. In addition to furnishing information that may allow regulators to look for "red flags" indicative of a fraudulent offering, Form D provides regulators with the only direct source of information about the "private placement" market generally. The modest burden that Form D may impose on

issuers is vastly outweighed by the essential role that it plays in state and federal efforts to understand and police the Rule 506 marketplace.

State securities regulators oppose Section 3 of H.R. 2357 or any action by Congress that would further diminish the ability of regulators to effectively regulate the private placement marketplace, effectively address investor protection concerns associated with these offerings, or gather important data that provides minimal transparency of this otherwise opaque market.

Thank you for your consideration of NASAA's views. Please do not hesitate to contact me or Michael Canning, NASAA's Director of Policy, if we may be of any additional assistance.

Sincerely,

JUDITH M. SHAW,  
NASAA President and Marine  
Securities Administrator.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Again, I urge a "no" vote on this. I feel it is a very dangerous bill, but I would also like to point out to my good friends on the other side of the aisle that keep talking about the economy, and I would like to point out that when President Obama took office, this country was shedding 700,000 jobs a month, and because of his leadership and Democratic policies, we have climbed out of that deep red valley of job loss and we are gaining jobs. Since March of 2010, this country has gained 14.6 million private sector jobs. That is a lot better than losing 700,000 jobs a month.

When President Obama walked into office, we were at 10 percent unemployment. We are now at 4.9 percent unemployment. I can assure you, no Democrat will be satisfied until every American who wants a job has a good American job, but this is a shift in the right direction of an improved economy. We have had well over 74 months of private sector job growth and, again, we are climbing—we would like to be doing better, but, again, it is a lot better than shedding 700,000 jobs a month.

One of the ways that we grow an economy is by having safety and soundness in our financial institutions, trust in our financial institutions, trust that investors will be protected, and that is why I feel so strongly that this bill is going in the wrong direction. We should be protecting investors, not putting them more at risk.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on each side, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a distinguished member of our Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I was just listening to my friend from New York, and I would like just sort of a little consistency. At one point we talk about job growth and the des-

perate need for more job growth, but then how many have come behind the microphones today and talked about a little technical problem we have. We are shedding—closing—more small businesses than we are opening, and this has been going on for years now.

So those of us who were involved in the JOBS Act a few years ago—and remember, it was a bipartisan discussion saying we desperately need to find ways to move capital to the little businesses that are just trying to find some cash, some way to grow, some way to expand. And then you look at a piece of legislation like this, and let's be brutally honest with each other, these are little tiny things that do good, but this isn't necessarily a revolution of Dodd-Frank. It is not a revolution of the capital markets. These are silly—excuse me, these are simple—simple—logical, obvious steps.

Let's take a look at some of the small offerings. If I am reaching out to people who know me, know my business, it is limited to, what, 35? That is somehow a risk to the financial stability of the country that I am a small entrepreneur and I may be able to reach out to people who know me and my business and ask them to invest in my capital formation so I can grow and create those jobs and expand the business as I desperately need?

How about cleaning up what we all agreed to, what, 4 or 5 years ago in regards to reg D offerings of how it mechanically was going to work? Remember, we sat there over and over for weeks discussing how reg Ds were going to work, and then the SEC decides they are going to change what we all thought the understanding was. How is that a danger to capital markets, fixing where we already thought we were?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. In some ways it breaks my heart, and I wish we could get over this game we play around here where it is a Republican piece of legislation, and a couple of my friends on the left feel obligated to stand up and oppose it, even though you and I know when we had the conversations of building parts of this just 4 years ago, 5 years ago, these were the very things we talked about we were agreeing to.

We desperately need economic expansion if we are going to keep the social entitlement promises of this society, and to stand in front of even the small attempts to expand the economy—we need to get on the same page here.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my good friend on the other side of the aisle.

Democrats certainly support expanding and growing capital markets and liquidity in the markets. I was one of the lead sponsors on portions of the



JOBS Act, and I supported the JOBS Act, but I do not support rolling back protections for investors.

The protections that are in the law now, that they are attempting to roll back—which they will not be able to because the President has said he will veto it—these protections are not Dodd-Frank. These have nothing to do with Dodd-Frank, although I understand there will be a markup totally repealing it next week, so I have been told. But these are protections that have been on the books for decades. Title III, in particular, concerns a \$2.1 trillion market. Now, that is not a small deal. \$2.1 trillion is a lot of money.

We just are recovering from massive rollbacks of regulations which economists say led to the worst economic downturn in the history of this country. Christina Romer testified before this Congress that the economic shocks at the time she was the head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers were three times deeper and stronger than the Great Depression. So I am mystified why anyone would want to roll back protections for investors that have worked well for people in this country.

We have the strongest markets in the world. More people invest here, come here because they trust our markets. Why in the world do we want to undermine that trust? I would say that the best way to stimulate investment is to treat investors well, and that means strong investor protections.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I simply want a little colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York about what she just alluded to. I think she said something about we will be faced with legislation very soon that would roll back all of the work we have done with Dodd-Frank? Did I hear her say something like that?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. As the ranking member knows, there is a bill before the Committee on Financial Services which would completely roll back Dodd-Frank. I was clarifying that these rollbacks have nothing to do with Dodd-Frank.

□ 1530

These are protections that have been on the books since we recovered from the Great Depression. But, apparently, that is on the agenda, or so I have been told. I am not in charge. The gentleman across is the chairman. He knows the schedule, but I have been told that that will be before the committee next week.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank the gentleman from the great State of Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chair, we are at a time when the American people are forced to comply with crushing regulations that stifle business growth and strip Americans of their livelihood. At this time, Congress must take steps to reduce the red tape in the private sector.

Earlier this year, the American Action Forum reported that the Dodd-Frank Act is costing Americans and consumers more now than any time since it was enacted. What ObamaCare has done to the cost of health care, Dodd-Frank has done to our financial sector.

Since it was enacted, this law has resulted in 73 million hours of paperwork and \$36 billion of harmful costs riding on the backs of taxpayers. In fact, The Wall Street Journal reports that regulatory compliance is now the fastest growing job field in the financial services sector.

To put that in perspective, Dodd-Frank takes 37,000 full-time employees just to comply with the law for 1 year. These statistics are evidence of Ronald Reagan's warning that "government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem."

H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act, would expand the number of companies that are eligible to use a simplified registration form for public offerings, which will allow companies to obtain SEC approval in a matter of days instead of months.

For too long, the SEC has been a barrier to investment capital, which is contrary to its mission. This change would allow private companies to focus more on growing their businesses and creating jobs and less on complying with excessive regulations.

Mr. Chair, at a time when our Nation is in the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression, we must take bold and decisive steps to reduce the excessive reach of government in our lives and foster a healthy economy. H.R. 2357 achieves these goals, and I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the American people continue to suffer in this lackluster economy.

I don't care what happy talk there is from Washington politicians, the American people know the economy is not working for them. They have anxiety about how they are going to pay their bills. Their paychecks are stagnant. Their savings have been decimated. And they look around, and where is the economic opportunity? Small business has been decimated in America. The job engine of America has been decimated.

As one of my constituents from Henderson County told me, when regulations get out of control, they put many small businesses out of business. And that is what we are seeing today, Mr. Chairman. People aren't getting ahead.

We need to unlock capital for our innovators, for our entrepreneurs, for

our small businesses. We have three modest bills today that are doing just that. And yet we are being fought tooth and nail by those who want to grow Washington's economy and not the Main Street economy; those who believe that Washington bureaucrats always know what is best.

This House must enact the Accelerating Access to Capital Act. You can't have capitalism without capital. Small businesses can't get it, innovators can't get it, entrepreneurs can't get it.

So it is time that we move forward. And there is great news for the minority, who must not realize—I wish they would study and see this—we still have the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Investment Company Act of 1940, and it goes on.

You can't have an effective market without consumer protection. But guess what? We also must have capital formation if we are going to have a healthy economy for working families that are falling behind after 8 years of Obamanomics. We must pass H.R. 2357, the Accelerating Access to Capital Act.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of H.R. 2357, the Accelerating-Access to Capital Act, which continues to build on the successes of the JOBS Act to stimulate capital formation for small businesses to help grow the economy and create good-paying jobs.

Last week, I visited the Venture Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, with my good friend Mrs. WAGNER, the lead sponsor of this bill.

The Venture Center has been working with the public financial services IT company, Fidelity Information Systems (FIS) to launch the VC FinTech Accelerator, a program that will bring innovators and entrepreneurs from across the world to Little Rock.

I had the pleasure of attending their Demo Day last month, where FIS and the Governor of Arkansas announced a two-year partnership with the program.

This exciting program has only been active for a short time, but has already proven its ability to assist in our efforts to grow new technology jobs across the region.

These start-ups, however, often face significant and costly hurdles to obtain funding in the capital markets that is necessary to continue to grow or go public, as the cost of securities regulation disproportionately falls on small companies.

H.R. 2357 helps reduce some of this regulatory burden by making it easier for small companies to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission and creates a cost-effective way for small companies to raise capital through "micro-offerings," so long as the sale meets certain criteria.

It also prevents the SEC's costly and complex proposed Regulation D rules from taking effect, which are inconsistent with the JOBS Act and Congress' intent to make it easier for small businesses to raise capital.

We need regulation in our capital markets, but we need smart regulation that does not unduly burden startups across the nation, who are at the forefront of innovation and job creation.

I thank my colleagues on the Committee—Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. EMMER, and Capital Markets Subcommittee Chairman GARRETT—for

their work on this thoughtful legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-62. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2357

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Accelerating Access to Capital Act of 2016”.*

#### TITLE I—ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CAPITAL

##### SEC. 1. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR USE OF FORM S-3.

*Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Form S-3—*

*(1) so as to permit securities to be registered pursuant to General Instruction I.B.1. of such form provided that either—*

*(A) the aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates of the registrant is \$75,000,000 or more; or*

*(B) the registrant has at least one class of common equity securities listed and registered on a national securities exchange; and*

*(2) so as to remove the requirement of paragraph (c) from General Instruction I.B.6. of such form.*

##### TITLE II—MICRO-OFFERING SAFE HARBOR

##### SEC. 2. EXEMPTIONS FOR MICRO-OFFERINGS.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77d) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:*

*“(8) transactions meeting the requirements of subsection (f).”; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(f) CERTAIN MICRO-OFFERINGS.—*

*“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the transactions referred to in subsection (a)(8) are transactions involving the sale of securities by an issuer (including all entities controlled by or under common control with the issuer) that meet all of the following requirements:*

*“(A) PRE-EXISTING RELATIONSHIP.—Each purchaser has a substantive pre-existing relationship with an officer of the issuer, a director of the issuer, or a shareholder holding 10 percent or more of the shares of the issuer.*

*“(B) 35 OR FEWER PURCHASERS.—There are no more than, or the issuer reasonably believes that there are no more than, 35 purchasers of securities from the issuer that are sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8) during the 12-month period preceding such transaction.*

*“(C) SMALL OFFERING AMOUNT.—The aggregate amount of all securities sold by the issuer, including any amount sold in reliance on the exemption provided under subsection (a)(8), during the 12-month period preceding such transaction, does not exceed \$500,000.*

*“(2) DISQUALIFICATION.—*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—The exemption provided under subsection (a)(8) shall not be available for a transaction involving a sale of securities if any person described in subparagraph (B) would have triggered disqualification pursuant*

*to section 230.506(d) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations.*

*“(B) PERSONS DESCRIBED.—The persons described in this subparagraph are the following:*

*“(i) The issuer.*

*“(ii) Any predecessor of the issuer.*

*“(iii) Any affiliated issuer.*

*“(iv) Any director, executive officer, other officer participating in the offering, general partner, or managing member of the issuer.*

*“(v) Any beneficial owner of 20 percent or more of the issuer’s outstanding voting equity securities, calculated on the basis of voting power.*

*“(vi) Any promoter connected with the issuer in any capacity at the time of such sale.*

*“(vii) Any investment manager of an issuer that is a pooled investment fund.*

*“(viii) Any person that has been or will be paid (directly or indirectly) remuneration for solicitation of purchasers in connection with such sale of securities.*

*“(ix) Any general partner or managing member of any such investment manager or solicitor.*

*“(x) Any director, executive officer, or other officer participating in the offering of any such investment manager or solicitor or general partner or managing member of such investment manager or solicitor.”.*

*(b) EXEMPTION UNDER STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 18(b)(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(4)) is amended—*

*(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “or” at the end;*

*(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and*

*(3) by adding at the end the following:*

*“(H) section 4(a)(8).”.*

#### TITLE III—PRIVATE PLACEMENT IMPROVEMENT

##### SEC. 3. REVISIONS TO SEC REGULATION D.

*Not later than 45 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 501 et seq.) in accordance with the following:*

*(1) The Commission shall revise Form D filing requirements to require an issuer offering or selling securities in reliance on an exemption provided under Rule 506 of Regulation D to file with the Commission a single notice of sales containing the information required by Form D for each new offering of securities no earlier than 15 days after the date of the first sale of securities in the offering. The Commission shall not require such an issuer to file any notice of sales containing the information required by Form D except for the single notice described in the previous sentence.*

*(2) The Commission shall make the information contained in each Form D filing available to the securities commission (or any agency or office performing like functions) of each State and territory of the United States and the District of Columbia.*

*(3) The Commission shall not condition the availability of any exemption for an issuer under Rule 506 of Regulation D (17 C.F.R. 230.506) on the issuer’s or any other person’s filing with the Commission of a Form D or any similar report.*

*(4) The Commission shall not require issuers to submit written general solicitation materials to the Commission in connection with a Rule 506(c) offering, except when the Commission requests such materials pursuant to the Commission’s authority under section 8A or section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77h–1 or 77t) or section 9, 10(b), 21A, 21B, or 21C of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78i, 78j(b), 78u–1, 78u–2, or 78u–3).*

*(5) The Commission shall not extend the requirements contained in Rule 156 to private funds.*

*(6) The Commission shall revise Rule 501(a) of Regulation D to provide that a person who is a “knowledgeable employee” of a private fund or*

*the fund’s investment adviser, as defined in Rule 3c-5(a)(4) (17 C.F.R. 270.3c-5(a)(4)), shall be an accredited investor for purposes of a Rule 506 offering of a private fund with respect to which the person is a knowledgeable employee.*

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-725. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 and amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2357) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise Form S-3 so as to add listing and registration of a class of common equity securities on a national securities exchange as an additional basis for satisfying the requirements of General Instruction I.B.1. of such form and to remove such listing and registration as a requirement of General Instruction I.B.6. of such form, and, pursuant to House Resolution 844, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KILMER. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kilmer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2357 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title III the following:

(7) CYBERSECURITY RISK DISCLOSURE.—The Commission shall revise Rule 506 of Regulation D to condition the availability of the

exemption under such Rule on an issuer's disclosure to the Commission of the issuer's cybersecurity risks. The Commission is authorized to tailor such disclosure requirement based on the size of the issuer making the disclosure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support the motion to recommit, which is about protecting the personal information of the American people. It would require that those who are soliciting investments directly from individuals to develop a plan to ensure their personal financial data is protected against cyberattacks.

Before coming to Congress, I spent a decade working in economic development professionally, and before that, I was a business consultant advising some of the Nation's leading technology companies. I actually agree with my Republican colleagues that we need to help small, innovative companies raise additional capital so that they can grow, bring their ideas to market, and create jobs. However, we need to make sure that these new companies are taking seriously the risk of cybersecurity to ensure that those who are putting up capital to fund these companies aren't subject to identity theft or other cybercrimes.

Last month, I met with a group of cyber professionals from my State who told me that the threat of cybercrime is growing exponentially. According to these experts, every single business that has access to confidential personal data should have a plan in place to protect that data and to quickly respond in the event of a cyber attack.

This isn't just anecdotal. We can look at the statistics. In 2005, cybercrime cost the average business just \$24,000. By 2015, that number had jumped to over \$1.5 million for the average American business.

We all want small and emerging companies to succeed. We also need to be sure that they are prepared to deal with the growing threat of cybercrime so that the personal information of their investors is protected.

We also know that the financial services industry is a particularly ripe target for cybercriminals. The Securities and Exchange Commission is already taking action on a case that resulted in the private records of more than 100,000 individuals being compromised. Commission Chair Mary Jo White has called cybersecurity the biggest risk to the financial system.

We also know the impacts of cybercrime can be real. For an individual, a stolen identity can be devastating. It can lead to financial losses, lost time at work or with family dedicated to the stressful and extensive ef-

fort of clearing up financial records. These impacts are even greater when the victim is a senior citizen, who are often targets of cybercrimes.

We need action for the future growth of our economy and to give investors confidence that their personal information will remain secure. The motion to recommit would do that. It would require companies taking advantage of rules that allow them to solicit investments directly from wealthy individuals to disclose their cybersecurity risks to the Securities and Exchange Commission. This will provide the SEC with a better approach to helping smaller companies deal with the threat of cybercrime.

The MTR is sensitive to the needs of smaller companies by allowing them to develop a plan that can be tailored to the size and risk profile of the company.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sensible approach to addressing a real and growing threat. It allows small companies to continue to take advantage of expedited procedures while protecting investors from identity theft and other crimes.

I encourage my colleagues to adopt the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news for my colleague from Washington. The Financial Services Committee has already passed a robust cybersecurity bill, and passed it on a strong bipartisan basis: 46-9. We look forward to working with all of our colleagues in the House to forwarding this bill, working with our colleagues on House Energy and Commerce Committee and others. It is a serious topic.

But I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this extra disclosure, if cybersecurity is material, it already must be disclosed under current law. And I would add that, yet again, this is just one more burden, the subject matter of the motion to recommit, when we are trying to ease burdens on capital formation.

I would remind all of my colleagues again that a recent report from the National Small Business Association released just this week showed that 41 percent of small businesses said that the lack of capital is hindering their ability to grow their business. If they can't grow their business, they can't give raises, they can't expand, they can't promote. Twenty percent said they had to reduce—actually lay off employees—as a result of tighter credit. That is the whole purpose, Mr. Speaker, of why we are passing this bill today. It is to grant greater access to capital.

We have heard from so many small businesses and angel investors across the Nation about the need for capital

formation for our entrepreneurs, for our small businesses, for our innovators. We have heard from the co-founder and CEO of NextSeed: "Obtaining traditional financing from banks is still a tall order for many small businesses, especially for smaller amounts."

Well, we want to respond to that.

□ 1545

We don't need yet one more hurdle from the motion to recommit to get in the way of small businesses' end capital. It is also one more out-of-pocket cost. We heard from the senior partner at Centerfield Capital: "These out-of-pocket costs and time spent by our professionals on SEC registration and compliance detract from our mission of empowering small businesses to grow."

We want to empower small businesses on Main Street to grow, yet the motion to recommit would do just the opposite.

Nothing could be more obvious than a quote from the gentleman, the CEO of Wilde & Company: "When corporations access capital, they hire people."

We want people hired. We want people promoted. We want people on good career tracks. We want middle-income people to rise. We want the working poor to become members of middle-income America, and they can't do that unless we access capital.

The choice again is: Are we going to have another top-down, Washington-grown economy, or are we going to build our economy from Main Street up?

House Republicans say it is time to build it from Main Street up. So it is time that we reject the motion to recommit and assure that our small businesses can access capital so that we can grow this economy, grow the family economy, and have a better America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 233, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—180

Adams	Becerra	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bera	F.
Ashford	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Beatty	Bonamici	Bustos

Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Pascarell	Knight	Noem	Shimkus	Clawson (FL)	Hunter	Pompeo
Capps	Higgins	Payne	Labrador	Nunes	Shuster	Coffman	Hurd (TX)	Posey
Cárdenas	Himes	Pelosi	LaHood	Olson	Simpson	Cole	Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom
Carney	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	LaMalfa	Palmer	Smith (MO)	Collins (GA)	Issa	Ratcliffe
Carson (IN)	Honda	Peters	Lamborn	Paulsen	Smith (NE)	Collins (NY)	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Cartwright	Hoyer	Peterson	Lance	Pearce	Smith (NJ)	Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pingree	Latta	Perry	Smith (TX)	Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Castro (TX)	Israel	Pocan	LoBiondo	Pittenger	Stefanik	Cook	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Polis	Long	Pitts	Stewart	Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rigell
Cicilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Stutzman	Cramer	Joyce	Roby
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Love	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Crawford	Katko	Roe (TN)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel	Lucas	Pompeo	Thornberry	Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Clay	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Tiberi	Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Cleaver	Keating	Richmond	Lummis	Price, Tom	Tipton	Culberson	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Trott	Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rokita
Cohen	Kennedy	Ruiz	Marchant	Reed	Turner	Davidson	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Connolly	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Marino	Renacci	Upton	Davis, Rodney	Kline	Roskam
Conyers	Kilmer	Rush	Massie	Ribble	Valadao	Denham	Knight	Rothfus
Cooper	Kind	Ryan (OH)	McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Wagner	Dent	Labrador	Rouzer
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda T.	McCaul	Rigell	Walberg	DeSantis	LaHood	Royce
Courtney	Kuster		McClintock	Roby	Walden	Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Russell
Crowley	Langevin		McHenry	Roe (TN)	Walker	Dold	Lamborn	Salmon
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Walorski	Donovan	Lance	Sanford
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)	Duffy	Latta	Scalise
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Schiff	Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)	Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Davis, Danny	Lee	Schrader	McSally	Rokita	Wenstrup	Duncan (TN)	Long	Scott, Austin
DeFazio	Levin	Scott (VA)	Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman	Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Lewis	Scott, David	Meehan	Roskam	Williams	Emmer (MN)	Love	Sessions
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Serrano	Messer	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)	Farenthold	Lucas	Shimkus
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)	Mica	Rouzer	Wittman	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
DelBene	Loebach	Sherman	Miller (FL)	Royce	Womack	Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Simpson
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sinema	Miller (MI)	Russell	Woodall	Fleischmann	MacArthur	Smith (MO)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sires	Moolenaar	Salmon	Yoder	Fleming	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Dingell	Lowe	Slaughter	Mooney (WV)	Sanford	Yoho	Flores	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)	Mullin	Scalise	Young (AK)	Forbes	Massie	Smith (TX)
Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)	Speier	Mulvaney	Schweikert	Young (IA)	Fortenberry	McCarthy	Stefanik
Duckworth	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)	Fox	McCaul	Stewart
Edwards	(NM)	Takano	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin	Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Stivers
Ellison	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)	Newhouse	Sessions	Zinke	Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Stutzman
Engel	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)				Garrett	McKinley	Thompson (PA)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Titus				Gibbs	McMorris	Thornberry
Esty	Matsui	Tonko	Bishop (GA)	Katko	Ross	Gibson	Rodgers	Tiberi
Farr	McCollum	Torres	Brown (FL)	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	Gohmert	McSally	Tipton
Foster	McDermott	Tsongas	Capuano	Nugent	Stivers	Goodlatte	Meadows	Trott
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Van Hollen	DesJarlais	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)	Gosar	Meehan	Turner
Fudge	McNerney	Vargas	Guinta	Reichert	Walters, Mimi	Gowdy	Messer	Upton
Gabbard	Meeks	Veasey	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland	Granger	Mica	Valadao
Gallego	Meng	Vela				Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Garamendi	Moore	Velázquez				Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Graham	Moulton	Visclosky				Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	Walz				Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Green, Al	Nadler	Wasserman				Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Green, Gene	Schultz	Schultz				Guthrie	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
Grijalva	Neal	Waters, Maxine				Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Watson Coleman				Hardy	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
Hahn	Norcross	Welch				Harper	Newhouse	Westerman
Hastings	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)				Harris	Noem	Williams
	Pallone	Yarmuth				Hartzler	Nunes	Wilson (SC)

## NOT VOTING—18

□ 1608

Messrs. DENHAM, ZINKE, Mrs. BLACK, Messrs. ROSKAM, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, WEBSTER of Florida, NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. POLIQUIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 178, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

## AYES—236

Abraham	Conaway	Granger	Bishop (GA)	Katko	Ross	Gibson	Rodgers	Tiberi
Aderholt	Cook	Graves (GA)	Brown (FL)	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	Gohmert	McSally	Tipton
Allen	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)	Capuano	Nugent	Stivers	Goodlatte	Meadows	Trott
Amash	Cramer	Graves (MO)	DesJarlais	Palazzo	Swalwell (CA)	Gosar	Meehan	Turner
Amodei	Crawford	Griffith	Guinta	Reichert	Walters, Mimi	Gowdy	Messer	Upton
Babin	Crenshaw	Grothman	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland	Granger	Mica	Valadao
Barletta	Culberson	Guthrie				Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Hanna				Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Barton	Davidson	Hardy				Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Harper				Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Bilirakis	Denham	Harris				Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hartzler				Guthrie	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Heck (NV)				Hanna	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
Black	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling				Hardy	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
Blackburn	Dold	Herrera Beutler				Harper	Newhouse	Westerman
Blum	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.				Harris	Noem	Williams
Bost	Duffy	Hill				Hartzler	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Holding				Heck (NV)	Olson	Wittman
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson				Hensarling	Palmer	Womack
Brat	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp				Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Woodall
Bridenstine	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)				Hice, Jody B.	Pearce	Yoder
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Hultgren				Hill	Perry	Yoho
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Hunter				Holding	Peterson	Young (AK)
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)				Hudson	Pittenger	Young (IA)
Buck	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)				Huelskamp	Pitts	Young (IN)
Bucshon	Fleming	Issa				Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Zeldin
Burgess	Flores	Jenkins (KS)				Hultgren	Poliquin	Zinke
Byrne	Forbes	Jenkins (WV)						
Calvert	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)						
Carter (GA)	Fox	Jolly	Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)	Adams	Clyburn	Foster
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Jones	Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan	Aguilar	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jordan	Allen	Black	Buck	Bass	Connolly	Fudge
Chaffetz	Garrett	Joyce	Amash	Blackburn	Bucshon	Beatty	Conyers	Gabbard
Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Kelly (MS)	Amodei	Blum	Burgess	Becerra	Cooper	Gallego
Coffman	Gibson	Kelly (PA)	Babin	Boast	Byrne	Berra	Costa	Garamendi
Cole	Gohmert	King (IA)	Barletta	Boustany	Calvert	Beyer	Courtney	Graham
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	King (NY)	Barr	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)	Blumenauer	Crowley	Grayson
Collins (NY)	Gosar	Kinzinger (IL)	Barton	Brat	Carter (TX)	Bonamici	Cummings	Green, Al
Comstock	Gowdy	Kline	Benishek	Bridenstine	Chabot	Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
			Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz		Davis, Danny	Grijalva
							DeFazio	Gutiérrez
							Brownley (CA)	Hahn
							Bustos	DeGette
							Butterfield	Delaney
							Capps	DeLauro
							Capuano	DelBene
							Cárdenas	DeSaulnier
							Carney	Deutch
							Carson (IN)	Dingell
							Cartwright	Hoyer
							Castor (FL)	Huffman
							Castro (TX)	Israel
							Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee
							Cicilline	Jeffries
							Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)
							Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.
							Clay	Jones
							Cleaver	Kaptur
								Keating
								Kelly (IL)

## NOES—178

Kennedy	Moore	Schrader
Kildee	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Killmer	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kind	Nadler	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Kuster	Neal	Sherman
Langevin	Nolan	Sinema
Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Sires
Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Slaughter
Lawrence	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lee	Pascrell	Speier
Levin	Payne	Takano
Lewis	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Perlmuter	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Peters	Titus
Loebach	Pingree	Tonko
Lofgren	Pocan	Torres
Lowenthal	Polis	Tsongas
Lowey	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Lujan Grisham	Quigley	Vargas
(NM)	Rangel	Veasey
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Vela
(NM)	Richmond	Velázquez
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Carolyn	Ruiz	Walz
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Matsui	Rush	Schultz
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Waters, Maxine
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Watson Coleman
McGovern	T.	Welch
McNerney	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
Meeks	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Meng	Schiff	

## NOT VOTING—17

Ashford	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bishop (GA)	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Brown (FL)	Nugent	Swalwell (CA)
DesJarlais	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Guinta	Reichert	Westmoreland
Higgins	Rooney (FL)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1616

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAUBONSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Waubonsee Community College, which is celebrating 50 years of service to northern Illinois.

Founded in August of 1966, it was named after a Native American chief, whose name means “early dawn,” and provides innovative education to its students. Offering career programs, business training, and professional learning, the college has stayed true to its mission of fostering a literate, democratic society through accessible, quality, and innovative institutions.

This month, Waubonsee will reopen its Aurora Fox Valley Campus, dedicated to health programs. Critical to Waubonsee's success is President Dr. Christine Sobek.

As a member of my Higher Education Advisory Committee, she regularly provides me with advice and wisdom on the needs of community colleges and guidance on improving education policy at the Federal level. I am grateful

for her friendship and leadership in offering students high-quality education.

Congratulations, Waubonsee, on your 50th anniversary. Your hard work helps our community's students succeed.

## DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE HACKING

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 2016 is shaping up to be a banner year for cybersecurity, and not in a good way. From attacks on the Ukrainian power grid to attempts to undermine American electoral confidence through the dissemination of hacked documents from the Democratic National Committee, cyber tools are fully emerging as instruments of state power.

If these incidents seem to be disproportionately affecting us and our allies, it is because our cybersecurity posture has not yet matched the threat we face. That being said, we recognize, of course, it is easier to attack than to defend.

Thankfully, there are steps we can take to protect our networks. We can invest in our cyber defenses, we can clarify cybersecurity roles and responsibilities within government, we can build our workforce to take on these new challenges, and we can also build our resilience.

The goal of our adversaries is not necessarily just to leak emails, but it is to shake faith in our electoral system. We cannot allow that to happen.

## PENNSYLVANIA WILDS CENTER FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in August, I was proud to announce a grant of \$500,000 from the Appalachian Regional Commission to the Pennsylvania Wilds Center for Entrepreneurship, located in Warren County in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

The Pennsylvania Wilds region includes 2 million acres of land in the north central and northwestern portion of Pennsylvania and includes 12 counties. Tourism in that area has increased dramatically in recent decades, with plenty of opportunities for fishing, hunting, kayaking, and canoeing, not to mention plenty of forestland for hiking.

This grant will be dedicated to the Center's Nature Tourism Cluster Development in the Pennsylvania Wilds, which is intended to develop a network of small businesses to support the increased need for products and services in the Pennsylvania Wilds region.

The Pennsylvania Wilds Center for Entrepreneurship currently offers two business development programs, assist-

ing prospective businessowners one on one to connect them with lenders, technical assistance providers, marketers, public lands managers, and other resources needed to start a business.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is one of Pennsylvania's largest and most vibrant industries. I look forward to seeing what this initiative can do to help grow the industry in the communities of the Pennsylvania Wilds.

## GUN VIOLENCE IN NEW YORK CITY

(Mr. MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, Tiarah Poyau was young and full of life, like my daughters. She was the same age as many of the interns in my office. Like them, she had big dreams and she was full of promise. She completed her bachelor of science at St. John's University in my district and was pursuing a master's degree. She dreamt of being an accountant.

At 22, she had the promise of being a successful young woman and an outstanding and upstanding member of society. But those dreams and that promise, they ended this past weekend. They ended when Tiarah's life was cut short by a bullet in New York City.

That same night, less than a block away from where she was shot, 17-year-old Tyreke Borel was gunned down—less than a block away.

Behind every gun death is a person like Tiarah and Tyreke, a person with dreams and with promise. These victims of gun violence and their families and friends have received thoughts and prayers from this Congress, but because of the Republican majority, they haven't received action.

Victims and their loved ones deserve better. They deserve a debate and a vote on commonsense gun reform on the House floor.

In this Nation, we encourage our kids to dream big. We tell them that with hard work, they can transform their potential into success. We let them down if we fail to protect them, and so far, that is exactly what we have done.

## HONORING HOWARD “RED” MCCARRICK

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Howard “Red” McCarrick, a World War II veteran from Lake Orion, Michigan.

On a whim, Mr. McCarrick signed up for the United States Army Air Corps in 1942. He had to wait until his 18th birthday in 1943 before officially joining. Initially, Mr. McCarrick trained to be a pilot, but he changed his focus and volunteered to be a ball turret gunner.

After graduating gunner training as a corporal, he flew B-24s on national

security missions until the end of World War II and was honorably discharged in 1946.

After his time in the Army Air Corps, Mr. McCarrick continued down the path of public service, working for the Rochester Community Schools for 31 years.

Mr. McCarrick is an American hero—a patriot, a father, and a proud member of the Lake Orion community. He was recently honored by Chief Jerry Narsh and the Lake Orion Police Department as the 2016 Lake Orion Honored Veteran.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have such an outstanding American hero in my district.

Thank you, Mr. McCarrick, for your service to our country and your commitment to our community.

#### RECOGNIZING CLARESSA SHIELDS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable young woman from Flint, my hometown. Her name is Claressa Shields. Her accomplishments as an athlete and as an Olympian and continued commitment to our State and to our community really make us proud.

Introduced to boxing at a young age, Claressa has built an impressive career that boasts two consecutive gold medals from the 2012 Olympics in London and the 2016 Olympics in Rio de Janeiro.

That feat makes her the first American, male or female, to win back-to-back gold medals in boxing. She also made history in 2012 at the Olympics in London when she became the first American woman ever to win gold in boxing.

Through her victories, Claressa has inspired the dreams of young people in Michigan and across the country. She is an extraordinary young woman who credits her success to hard work and to her faith.

Claressa Shields represents the resilience of the American Dream and the strong, proud spirit of our mutual hometown of Flint. I applaud her for her dedication to her sport, and thank her for her dedication to our hometown. The good news is Claressa Shields is just getting started.

#### RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA'S LUNAR AND PLANETARY LAB

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, it is launch day. I rise today to recognize the dedicated men and women at the University of Arizona's Lunar and Planetary Lab, who are leading NASA's historic OSIRIS-REx space mission.

Launching from Cape Canaveral, Florida, tonight, the OSIRIS-REx spacecraft will embark on a 7-year journey to the Bennu asteroid, where it will collect samples before returning to Earth. If successful, the mission will mark the first time a spacecraft has gathered samples from a moving asteroid.

The University of Arizona's leadership of the OSIRIS-REx mission adds to its already impressive reputation in planetary sciences.

I would like to extend my best wishes to all of the scientists at UA and elsewhere working on this project for a successful launch and mission.

□ 1630

#### JEFF AND DERALYN'S 60TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Jeff and Deralyn Davis of Fort Worth, who celebrated 60 years of marriage on August 25 of this year.

Jeff met his beloved Deralyn and began a courtship that led them to the sacred union of marriage on August 25, 1956, in Corsicana, Texas. For 55 years of their union, they have been residents of the city of Fort Worth. Throughout the years, Jeff and Deralyn have been very, very active in the community.

Jeff is a member of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity and has served as the assistant superintendent of the Everman Independent School District. Jeff's influence in education was such that he was commemorated by having a school named after him—the Jefferson Davis 9th Grade Center.

Deralyn was a graduate of Jackson High School in Corsicana and was a graduate of Huston-Tillotson University in Austin. She is also active in AKA, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, the Fort Worth chapter. Deralyn was also very instrumental in the creation of the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats during its heyday.

The Davises have two children—daughter Jefflyn Davis and their son, Jock Kevin Davis, who passed away in 2005—and three grandchildren.

I congratulate Jeff and Deralyn on 60 years of marriage.

#### IN MEMORY OF ROBERT KERSTIENS, SR.

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate a man who, I think, is bigger than life. He is a longtime resident of Red Bluff, California. He is a cattleman. His name is Robert Kerstiens, Sr. He just passed recently here at the age of 92.

Mr. Kerstiens was a World War II veteran and was also a ranger with CAL

FIRE in California. He was a well-respected and revered figure in the community, known for his selfless service, caring personality, and strong leadership.

Straight out of high school, Bob joined the Army and was immediately sent off to training. When recalling his time in serving the country, we learned he was involved in the Battle of the Bulge and in the Battle of Remagen, which earned him a Bronze Star as well as a Presidential Unit Citation for his group. These are places I have read about in history and that movies have been made about. Bob Kerstiens has lived that, and he was an integral part of helping win those battles—very important ones for us in winning the war in Europe.

Following his return from the war, Kerstiens continued his path of service in a new role—as a firefighter foreman for CAL FIRE, where he worked his way up the ranks to the department's ranger in charge, after which he was appointed to the State Board of Forestry. His service and contributions to our community and State left a lasting impact that shaped many of the policies that keep our forests safe and healthy.

In the community, his involvement never went unnoticed. An eight-time board president on the Tehama District Fair Board, a shareholder in the Red Bluff Round-Up Association, and a beloved judge of the Wild Horse Race Rodeo, his involvement never went unnoticed. He was a true cattleman, a true gentleman, a great man from Tehama County in northern California. He will be missed.

#### PASS THE FAMILIES OF FLINT ACT

(Mr. HUFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing crisis in Flint, Michigan, is a clear reminder that this Congress has unfinished work to do.

Our constituents will rightly judge our job performance by our work, not by our finger-pointing, not by empty expressions of concern. We need to get to work, and we need to work together to provide clean water for the people of Flint; but we can't stop there because Flint is not an isolated incident. We have seen dangerous lead levels in schools that are outside of Fresno, California, and that are even in our own Capitol buildings here in Washington, D.C.

What has happened in Flint is a symptom of a much greater ill of underinvestment in our Nation's clean water infrastructure. A generation ago, it was a Republican President and a Californian, Ronald Reagan, who signed significant updates to the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1986. He knew then that clean water infrastructure was not a partisan issue. Thirty years



later, it is our turn. The bipartisan case for investing in clean water infrastructure has never been stronger.

Every single American deserves access to clean and safe drinking water. So let's get to work. Let's pass the Families of Flint Act, and let's work on a national clean water infrastructure plan to prevent another disaster like this from happening in the future.

#### THE ZIKA VIRUS AND GUN SAFETY

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo the pleas of the American people, especially those in my own home district of the United States Virgin Islands, in calling for this Congress to pass a Zika funding bill and to pass commonsense gun safety legislation.

It has been more than 6 months since the President submitted a plan to this Congress and almost 3 months since House Democrats took to the floor to call for a vote on commonsense gun safety legislation. Instead of passing these bills, Congress has decided to focus its attention on politically charged investigations into investigations. While this Congress was in its longest recess in 60 years, the number of overall confirmed Zika cases and the number of Americans killed and wounded by gun violence continued to grow.

There have been 4,500 lives lost to gun violence in the time that we have been out in recess. This number, sadly, includes the lives of almost a dozen young men and women in the Virgin Islands, including the lives of two police officers and a firefighter. Additionally, there are now more than 11,000 confirmed cases of Zika in the United States, 243 of those confirmed cases being in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and 14 of those are pregnant women.

The lifetime cost of treating a child with microcephaly is estimated to be more than \$10 million for that child—a cost that will only exacerbate the financial woes of this country's and the territories' public health apparatus. The lack of funding for these public health activities will put hundreds of thousands of pregnant women at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I call on this Congress to act quickly and fully fund the President's emergency request to fight the Zika virus as well as to pass lifesaving, commonsense gun safety legislation.

#### THE ZIKA VIRUS: A PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the cries of our colleagues. You have heard the cries of the American people. Redundancy is not a question here. It is telling the

truth. In fact, our health professionals have indicated that the Zika virus presents an unprecedented threat to the people of our Nation, especially to pregnant women. We cannot hear this often enough, and although busy with the beginning of the school year and with going back to work, it is important to warn the American people of this impending and ongoing threat.

While we are fiddling and doing things that have no impact on providing a portion of the \$1.9 billion that is needed by the American people, we have 1,600 cases of Zika virus in the United States—200 plus women who are pregnant and 35 known transmitted diseases here in the United States of the Zika virus. We also now know, through health professionals, that it is sexually transmitted. We know that the entire United States is vulnerable, but most of the vulnerable States are in the Gulf region.

It is time now to address the question of funding without riders, like preventing Planned Parenthood from getting funding, and without riders for allowing the Confederate flag to be in a veterans' cemetery.

Where is our concern about the American people—for the people in Louisiana with a lot of water? for the people in Texas with a lot of water? in Florida? in Puerto Rico?

It is important that this funding comes now to rapidly expand mosquito control programs and to accelerate a vaccine. That is really important—to be able to provide the American people with a vaccine. They are in the midst of the research. They need the funding. The CDC and the NIH have reprogrammed more money than they have to try to help those who are desperate.

I make the argument that it is time now for us to do the job. The other body needs to engage in providing a bill, and this body, this House, needs to stop playing those kinds of politics and provide the funding—the funding that does not take from Ebola but the funding that the American people need to be safe.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently in a state of a public health crisis as a result of the growing rate of Zika infections across the country.

Sadly, we are failing as our nation's leaders in our ability to respond to this crisis.

As days and month go by it is alarming and the level of action and inaction my colleagues are taking to hamper the ability of our federal government to respond to this rapidly growing public threat.

In particular, I am concerned that we—as a body of Congress—have not taken the critical steps to move forward and appropriate necessary funding that will help screen, treat, vaccinate and test deadly cases of Zika infections.

According to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, Congress should be looking for ways to strengthen our nation's regulatory system by identifying gaps and instituting new science-based safeguards for the public.

I cannot agree more—as we are now in perilous times where the Zika virus presents unprecedented threats to the people of our nation.

As cited by Tom Frieden, Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Anthony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health in an op-ed, dated August 21, 2016:

There have been more than 16,800 cases of Zika infection reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the U.S. and its territories, including more than 2,700 on the mainland.

Laboratory tests have confirmed that 1,595 pregnant women have been infected with the virus, and tragically, 17 babies have been born with birth defects related to Zika.

As highlighted by Frieden and Fauci—"We have an obligation to meet the Zika threat and protect this country"—as "the potential cost of a funding shortfall will be measured in human misery and even death."

Now is not the time to pass measures or engage in futile debates that will undermine or slow the ability of our federal and local governments to address and respond to this growing threat and active cases of Zika infections.

Rather, we need to invest in stopping this deadly, but preventable virus, before it is too late.

We cannot afford to stand by with our hands tied any longer.

Our limited time as the days in September wain down cannot be wasted.

We should be focused on the crucial mission of protecting our nation's people.

That is why, in these critical times of need, I am calling upon my colleagues to place the growing epidemic of the Zika virus at the top of our priorities and demand no less than fully financed measures to timely and adequately respond to this devastating and deadly public health emergency.

[From Time, Sept. 7, 2016]

HOW TO FIGHT ZIKA AND CURE NATION'S AILING PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM—ENACT A LAW TO RESPOND QUICKLY TO THREATS

(By Sheila Jackson Lee)

There is an excellent model that demonstrates how the U.S. should reform the current reactive model of public health emergency management—it is the solution found to address disasters established by the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. Under the Stafford Act, enacted in 1974 and later updated in 1988, authorizes the President of the United States, when disaster strikes, to deploy the coordinated efforts and resources of the federal government to save lives and property, and restore communities hit hard by a calamity. The federal government provides warnings of hurricanes and floods, and in cases of wildfires dispatches resources to extinguish flames before they threaten people and property.

The knowledge of public health experts, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, policy makers, health-care professionals and patient advocacy organizations should be brought together with the relevant committees in the House and Senate to develop measurable criteria to create baselines for defining, responding and mitigating public health threats to effectively and immediately without the delay engendered by the need for Congress to pass an emergency supplemental appropriations.

The U.S. must be capable of responding quickly to emerging threats that are identified anywhere in the world. The Ebola and Zika viruses for examples existed in other

nations for many years before they became a clear and present threat to public health in the Western Hemisphere and the U.S. The cost of waiting until a public health threat is present in the U.S. increases the threat to our nation's public health systems; it reduces the likelihood of success in winning the battle against a pathogen and it risks a new contagious disease becoming endemic—akin to the common cold. In addition, the cost of putting down a public health threat increases as time passes.

There is a long history of threats to public health posed by pathogens. In March 1918, in Kansas, the U.S. had its first case of the Spanish Flu, which is recorded as the first H1N1 flu epidemic. This pandemic killed 50 million persons worldwide it ended abruptly in 1919. The mortality rate of the Spanish Flu was as high as 1 death for every 5 infections and 50% of the deaths, or about 25 million, occurred in the first 25 weeks of the outbreak. We are now in the 31st week of the Zika Virus global health emergency, which was declared by the World Health Organization on Feb. 1, 2016.

The world is still battling the HIV/AIDS global pandemic, which became known to public health experts well before the disease made it into the United States. Still, it took President Clinton's efforts to put the full force of the federal government behind finding an effective treatment for HIV that slowed the progression of the disease from becoming full blown AIDs. By 2011, more than 60 million people globally had been infected by AIDS and 25 million had died.

The legislative process has proven itself not to respond in a timely manner to public health threats. The U.S. to be more robust enough needs to have in place mechanisms designed to respond systemically to federally declared public health emergencies and deliver assistance to support state and local governments in carrying out their responsibility to protect the public health. This is the second time in three years that a global health emergency has been declared that required Congress to act by passing a new law to fund the national response. This is the second time that the legislative process failed to act quickly when the public health threat was known and its consequences were clearly understood by domestic infectious disease experts.

On Aug. 24, 2014, the Democratic Republic of the Congo Ministry of Health notified the World Health Organization of an outbreak of Ebola virus. On Oct. 8, 2014, Ebola claimed the life of Thomas Eric Duncan after he presented symptoms at the time of admission to an emergency room. He had recently traveled to a country where the disease was actively being transmitted; he had a fever over two degrees accompanied by abdominal pain, dizziness, nausea and headache. Communications had gone to public health officials, hospitals, and health-care providers from the Centers for Disease Control stating that all patients should be asked whether they had traveled to West Africa recently; and checked for symptoms of Ebola, which include a dangerously high fever, abdominal pain, nausea and headache. Unfortunately, Mr. Duncan having all of the symptoms to be considered a possible Ebola patient was not admitted for observation, tests, and treatment, but instead sent home.

As of April 13, 2016, globally there were 28,652 suspected Ebola cases; 15,261 laboratory confirmed Ebola cases and 11,325 deaths from Ebola. Today, the CDC continue to monitor for Ebola disease outbreaks. We can no longer act as if a disease outbreak in a nation on the other side of the world has no relevance or importance to the public health status of communities within the U.S. In fact, we know that this is not the case. H1N1,

Ebola, and Zika viruses are hard lessons to the global health community teaching that the world has changed and that it is time the U.S. adjusts by becoming proactive and cease being reactive in preparing for and defending against public health threats and emergencies.

Establishing a model that is quantitative and based upon measurable changes in public health conditions around the world as well as within the U.S. and having the capacity to react quickly can save lives and assures public health system stability. Our nation has some local health-care systems that are second to none, such as the Houston Medical Center, but our national public health system has glaring weaknesses when handling pathogens that may be as dangerous as Ebola and as contagious as the Spanish Flu. There are only four hospitals in the U.S., and a total of 15-16 beds, for persons infected with a human viral hemorrhagic fever: Emory University Hospital in Atlanta has two Ebola beds, St. Patrick Hospital in Missoula, Montana, has one or two; National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, has the capacity to treat two patients in its Special Clinical Studies Unit, according to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the NIH; and Nebraska Medical Center in Omaha, reportedly has a biocontainment facility with 10 beds total.

The public health challenge for our nation is to effectively address the sudden emergence of a highly contagious pathogen with a mortality rate of 1 in 5 so that the public health threat may be identified within hours of patient zero, a team of public health experts deployed with the requisite equipment and resources within 24 hours to any point on the globe, establish field labs, hospitals, coordinate with local public health officials, communicate with public health and disease experts globally; type and identify the threat; its method of transmission; and determine what is needed to contain the threat; while beginning work on treatments and potential cures. Their work would also be to calculate mortality rates and the point when the disease may become endemic over a 25 week time period to stop its spread, which should include communicating to local, state and tribal public health officials' the information they will need to prepare to face the threat that may be just a flight away.

A Public Health Relief and Emergency Assistance Law is overdue—I urge the leadership of the House and the Senate to work in a bipartisan fashion to put on the desk of the President of the United States a law that will be the cure for the weaknesses in our nation's public health system when it is faced with public health emergencies.

President Obama is calling on Congress to fight the Zika virus by providing \$1.8 billion in emergency funds to:

Rapidly expand mosquito control programs.

Accelerate vaccine research and diagnostic development

Educate health providers, women, and partners about the disease.

Improve health services and support for low-income pregnant women.

Help Zika-affected countries better control transmission.

#### HOW IS ZIKA TRANSMITTED?

Zika is primarily spread to people through the bite of infected Aedes mosquitoes. It can also be transmitted from a pregnant mother to her baby during pregnancy, though we do not know how often that transmission occurs.

There is also evidence that the Zika virus can be sexually transmitted by a man to his

partners. At this time, however, there is no evidence that women can transmit the Zika virus to their sex partners. You can learn more about the Zika virus and guidance to avoid sexual transmission.

#### WHERE ARE PEOPLE CONTRACTING ZIKA?

People are contracting Zika in areas where Aedes mosquitoes are present, which include South America, Central America and the Caribbean. As the CDC notes, specific areas where the Zika virus is being transmitted are likely to change over time.

#### WHO IS AT RISK OF BEING INFECTED?

Anyone who is living in or traveling to an area where the virus is found is at risk for infection.

#### WHY ARE THERE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN?

There may be a link between a serious birth defect called microcephaly—a condition in which a baby's head is smaller than expected—and other poor pregnancy outcomes and a Zika infection in a mother during pregnancy. While the link between Zika and these outcomes is being investigated the CDC recommends that you take special precautions if you fall into one of these groups:

If you are pregnant (in any trimester):

You should consider postponing travel to any area where the Zika virus is active.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FLOODING IN LOUISIANA

(Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to come and update the House on the flooding conditions in the State of Louisiana. I talked about how this is, potentially, the fourth most costly flood disaster in U.S. history. Louisiana received 31 inches of rain in a 36-hour period, which is what the American average rainfall is. It would translate to nearly 25 feet of snow if it were a snowstorm.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put this in a personal context. Think about a person who owns a \$200,000 house. That person's house is now worth \$100,000 because it is flooded and gutted. That person is going to have to pay \$120,000 to finish his mortgage, which means he is upside down on his mortgage. It is going to cost him \$80,000 to rebuild his house, \$40,000 to replace his car, \$10,000 to replace his wardrobe.

Mr. Speaker, the Stafford Act is insufficient to address these financial situations that people are facing today. This isn't one person. This is tens of thousands of homeowners and businessowners across south Louisiana who are facing this impossible financial decision before them in the coming weeks.

I urge the White House to immediately send a supplemental appropriations request to the Congress. Let's get working on this and resolve this issue. Make this an easy decision for folks back home so we can get back on our feet.

15TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, September 11, marks the 15th anniversary of the vicious attacks on America.

I very much appreciate the leadership's scheduling a commemoration on the steps of the Capitol tomorrow morning, but more needs to be said as, I fear, time and events have dulled our memories.

In addition, our Nation has grown by over 60 million since September 11, 2001—children born after the towers came down, including the 13,000 babies who came into this world on that incredible day. Unlike the rest of us, they have no direct memories of these horrendous events that changed our Nation forever as hate-filled extremists struck in the streets of Lower Manhattan, in the fields of Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon. Over 700 citizens from my State of New Jersey died on that day.

Our mere words cannot possibly capture the sentiments that surround September 11. So in lieu of extended, formal remarks, I would like to read, as I have in past years, "The Names," a poem written by the then-poet laureate Billy Collins, which he read before a congressional joint session in New York City just after the attacks which Members of Congress heard firsthand.

"THE NAMES"

By Billy Collins

Yesterday, I lay awake in the palm of the night.

A soft rain stole in, unhelped by any breeze,  
And when I saw the silver glaze on the windows,

I started with A, with Ackerman, as it happened,

Then Baxter and Calabro,  
Davis and Eberling, names falling into place  
As droplets fell through the dark.

Names printed on the ceiling of the night.  
Names slipping around a watery bend.

Twenty-six willows on the banks of a stream.  
In the morning, I walked out barefoot  
Among thousands of flowers

Heavy with dew like the eyes of tears,  
And each had a name—

Fiori inscribed on a yellow petal  
Then Gonzalez and Han, Ishikawa and Jenkins.

Names written in the air  
And stitched into the cloth of the day.

A name under a photograph taped to a mailbox.

Monogram on a torn shirt,  
I see you spelled out on storefront windows  
And on the bright, unfurled awnings of this city.

I say the syllables as I turn a corner—  
Kelly and Lee,  
Medina, Nardella, and O'Connor.

When I peer into the woods,  
I see a thick tangle where letters are hidden  
As in a puzzle concocted for children.

Parker and Quigley in the twigs of an ash,  
Rizzo, Schubert, Torres, and Upton,  
Secrets in the boughs of an ancient maple.

Names written in the pale sky.

Names rising in the updraft amid buildings.

Names silent in stone

Or cried out behind a door.

Names blown over the Earth and out to sea.

In the evening—weakening light, the last swallows.

A boy on a lake lifts his oars.

A woman by a window puts a match to a candle,

And the names are outlined on the rose clouds—

Vanacore and Wallace,

(let X stand, if it can, for the ones unfound)

Then Young and Ziminsky, the final jolt of Z.

Names etched on the head of a pin.

One name spanning a bridge, another under-  
going a tunnel.

A blue name needled into the skin.

Names of citizens, workers, mothers and fathers,

The bright-eyed daughter, the quick son.

Alphabet of names in a green field.

Names in the small tracks of birds.

Names lifted from a hat

Or balanced on the tip of the tongue.

Names wheeled into the dim warehouse of memory.

So many names, there is barely room on the walls of the heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

IGNITING AMERICA'S ECONOMY  
WITH FAIRTAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am down here with some of my colleagues to talk about one thing, and one thing only in our time, and that is about igniting America's economy.

We can talk all we want to about putting people back to work; but nibbling around the edges of the American economy isn't going to solve the problem for the men and women in the Seventh District of Georgia, nor the men and women in the great State of Texas, nor the men and women in Alabama, or anywhere across this country.

What we need is a competitive advantage on the rest of the world. We have the most capable workforce on the planet. We have the hardest working workforce on the planet. We have the best infrastructure on the planet. We have the most freedom on the planet.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we then would not have the most robust and growing economy on the planet? I tell you it is for one reason, and one reason only, and that is the burden of the American Tax Code on the American entrepreneur.

It is the burden of the American Tax Code on those men and women who want to make America great, who want to put people back to work, but who cannot do it because the Tax Code disadvantages them relative to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, there is an idea in this Chamber—and you know it well—it is

called the FairTax, and it is H.R. 25. Anybody in America can look it up. It is at [www.congress.gov](http://www.congress.gov).

In just over 100 pages, H.R. 25 describes how we could rip this United States Tax Code out by the roots and replace it—where we can rip this Code out by the roots and, rather than having the single worst Tax Code on the planet, have the single best Tax Code on the planet. It describes how we could rip it out by the roots and, rather than punishing people for how productive they are, begin to tax people based on how much they take out of the economy, a consumption tax. That is the way our Framers founded this country, and that is the way we could fund this country again.

Mr. Speaker, right now is the time. With the economic challenges, the headwinds blowing against America as they are today, right now is the time. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on low wages. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on unsafe workplaces. I do not want to compete with the rest of the world based on whose air is dirtier or whose water is unsafe.

I want high wages. I want safe workplaces. I want clean water, and I want clean air. But I do want to compete with the rest of the world based on whose Tax Code makes the most sense.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected in 2010, just 5½ short years ago. One of the Members in that freshman class with me was Mo BROOKS from northern Alabama. He's down here on the floor tonight. When I got ready to introduce the FairTax in that Congress, Mo was one of the first folks out of the box to say, ROB, we can make a difference, we can make a difference for the country, and we can make a difference for individual families; put me down as a sponsor of the FairTax.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the opportunity to stand with him tonight as we discuss the FairTax. Quite frankly, I wish my eloquence was that of yours. Certainly, my passion is for the FairTax, with all the economic benefits that it would yield to the American people, the job creation it would yield, and the simplification of the headaches that occur every March and April as American people, including job creators, have to try to figure out how much taxes they have to pay.

In that vein, I have some prepared remarks, but I am available for any colloquy that you may want to have afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, America's Tax Code is so complex as to border on impossible for any one person to understand. According to the National Taxpayers Union, in 2016, American taxpayers suffered an economic loss of \$234 billion from the 1.9 billion hours of time spent trying to figure out and pay their taxes.

Making matters worse, from 1986 when President Reagan signed the Tax

Reform Act into law to today, the Tax Code has grown from 30,000 to 70,000 pages, more than doubling in size. Further, the corporate tax rate has skyrocketed to 39.1 percent, easily claiming the highest rate in the industrialized world.

I cannot emphasize enough the detrimental impact America's complicated Tax Code has on our economy and the burden it creates for taxpayers and job creators alike.

As such, I strongly support Representative ROB WOODALL's FairTax Act to abolish the Federal income tax, employment tax, and estate and gift tax, and replace them with a national sales tax and prebate that eliminates the effect of sales taxes on low-income families.

Businesses and families know how to best spend their hard-earned money. We need a system that puts power back into the hands of the taxpayer, not government bureaucrats. The FairTax proposal makes this possible. In particular, it eliminates the income tax and stops the Federal Government's snooping into American citizens' incomes, savings, and bank accounts, while still producing the revenue needed to fund the Federal Government.

The FairTax is simpler, thereby saving taxpayers billions of hours and hundreds of billions of dollars in trying to determine tax liability.

In addition, the FairTax dramatically stimulates America's economy by eliminating costly income tax and compliance costs for America's employers, thus cutting the cost of producing American goods and services by roughly 15 to 20 percent, a huge competitive advantage in an increasingly tough international marketplace. This competitive advantage for American job creators means more jobs and higher incomes for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring the FairTax legislation to the House floor for a vote to simplify the Tax Code, return American individual freedom, and grow the economy.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members of the House of Representatives to support this plain, commonsense way of collecting taxes, stimulating the economy, and getting the Federal Government more so out of our own personal lives.

Mr. Speaker, to the extent Congressman WOODALL has more that he wants to discuss, I am available.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman had me at more jobs and higher wages for workers. You had me there.

One of the things we don't ever talk about is the snooping that you describe. Now, "snooping" is a powerful word. As you were talking about that, it dawned on me that the Federal Government knows more about my finances than any member of my family. Think about that. The Federal Government knows more about me and my finances than I am willing to tell any member of my family.

When I think about freedom in this country, when I think about what the government needs to do to keep us safe, to keep the economy growing, I don't think about that degree of invasiveness as being necessary today.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is not just the snooping. It is also the coercion where the Federal Government uses, Washington uses the Tax Code to compel people to engage in conduct that they otherwise would not engage in, or to not engage in conduct that, under normal circumstances were they free to do so without potential retaliation by the IRS, they would engage in.

We have some issues, by way of example, where the Internal Revenue Service has been used to try to achieve political gains, where the Internal Revenue Service has been used to punish people because they have chosen to exercise their freedom of speech rights or their religious rights or because they chose to associate with some people rather than other people, all rights guaranteed in the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The power that we have given the Federal Government and the Internal Revenue Service through the Tax Code can all be taken away from the Federal Government by going to the FairTax.

The reasons to support the FairTax so far greatly outnumber any potential harms that detractors may describe. Again, I urge the Speaker of the House to allow this legislation to come up for a House floor vote so that we can support it, so that we can pass it through the House of Representatives. Should it fail, the American people will know who was on record in support of liberating the American people from the Internal Revenue Service and who wants to keep the Internal Revenue Service as our masters with our being in bondage to their whims. So there are lots of advantages and very few disadvantages.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia and the people of the great State of Georgia who have sent him here so that he can advocate on their behalf and advocate for a FairTax that just makes sense.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have appreciated the gentleman's friendship and his leadership since he and I arrived here together just two terms ago.

While the gentleman from Alabama was speaking, I put up a poster that has a postmark that reads April 15. You were talking about what it means to make March and April less intimidating, less frightening. He talked about coercion and intimidation.

I would wager there is not a single American citizen age 16 or older—anyone who has ever held a job and had a paycheck—that when I put up a postmark of April 15 they don't know exactly what that means. That means that is the day the tax man is going to come calling.

I am going to do the very best I can to get it right. But if I don't because it is too complex and I just can't figure it all out, the Federal Government and criminal enforcement are going to come calling. It is a frightening day for folks to do a civic responsibility, and that's to help keep the government open.

If I had to choose a region of the country that led as aggressively as Alabama leads, as Georgia leads, it would have to be the great State of Texas. We are joined tonight by the chairman from the great State of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY.

I believe, if I went back and counted all the cosponsors of the FairTax, the FairTax is the single most widely cosponsored tax reform bill in the entire United States House of Representatives. I believe we have more cosponsors from the State of Texas than any other State in the Nation. Of course, Texas has abolished their income tax and is governed by a consumption tax.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure Texas ever had an income tax, and I am pretty sure we are not ever going to have one.

As part of my professional background, I am a CPA and my license is still current. Before I joined Congress, I spent 30-plus years helping clients cope, deal, understand, and pay their taxes.

Speaking of the IRS and the intimidation factor, as a CPA, if I get a letter from the IRS addressed to me, my heart rate goes up before I open it. Now, it shouldn't be that way. It shouldn't have that kind of impact on any of us because I work really hard, as you might expect, to make sure that I get my taxes done.

My colleagues have both hit many of the high points on the FairTax. The choices we have out there now: there is the current Code, and there are advocates for that; there is a flat tax, and there are advocates for that; then there is a national sales tax, and I have cosponsored it after six terms and am proud to do that.

There are several reasons I have settled on the sales tax. One, it eliminates the IRS. Every government needs taxes in order to run. That tax collection scheme should have no other purpose, other than collecting the minimum amount of money needed to fund that government.

The current Code from '86 forward—and back, actually, to 1916—has been used over and over and over to manipulate this behavior, to incentivize that, disincentivize this, reward this half, punish, all these kinds of things.

□ 1700

That is manipulative and it is inefficient, and it is just the wrong use of a Tax Code. We shouldn't be using it that way. So that is why I have settled on a national sales tax. The reason I do that versus a flat tax is because, quite frankly, the flat tax, as most people understand it, leaves in place the IRS,

leaves in place the opportunity for the mischief that goes on with the current Code.

We could go to a flat tax, as we did sort of in 1986. The 1986 act was more in that direction. It reduced rates, flattened the rates out, eliminated some, those kinds of things. Thirty years later, we are more complicated today than we were in 1986. The flat tax leaves all of that opportunity for mischief in place going forward.

So the ink wouldn't be dry on the flat tax until somebody would say, hey, you know, if you give us a little relief on that flat tax thing for this area, look how it would prosper, grow the economy, create jobs, all those kinds of good things, and every one of those provisions are in there, so the flat tax and the current Code share much of that same risk.

Sales tax, on the other hand, is collected by the States. You would eliminate the IRS, so it is collected at the point of sale. The compliance, the studies show that the compliance with that sales tax would be greater than the current compliance we have with the income tax that we currently have, and so compliance would be better. It would be left up to the States to collect it. They would get a little slice for doing that on our behalf. The rest of the money would come into the Federal Government.

You would eliminate the entire bureaucracy that is the IRS and the good and the bad that they have done in the past, more bad lately than good because of the punishing taxpayers, going after taxpayers because their political beliefs are different from the current boss of the IRS, who is Barack Obama. That goes away, and it is just better.

I would caution, though, there are those who would argue, well, let's just do both. Let's have a little bitty income tax and a little bitty sales tax. Don't do that. The jurisdictions who have both wind up raising both. Let's pick one and stick with it, as hard as it might be to transition and all this kind of good stuff. Let's do that because of the impact it has on the opportunity for manufacturing in the United States to compete, as you just said. In addition to the tax, there is that overregulation thing that hurts them as well, but the Tax Code creates a huge competitive disadvantage that we can do something about now.

Overregulation, you know, that is in the eye of the beholder, but the income tax, the impact the income tax has on the cost of goods sold outside of the country, that is clear, and there is definitely something we could do about that.

I appreciate my colleague bringing this up.

The one thing that people ask back home who are supportive of the FairTax is: What do we do? How do we get this done? Quite frankly, it is educating taxpayers, because the uninitiated would listen to that 30-second commercial that says, you know,

this politician is in favor of a percentage increase in taxes. They leave out the little nugget that we would do away with the IRS, do away with income tax, estate tax. That kind of gets left out of that 30-second commercial.

We have got to have an educated taxpayer base out there that looks at that commercial and says, no, wait a minute, as Paul Harvey said, that is not—there is more to it, there is “the rest of the story” associated with that tax increase that they would like to champion this to go against it—so, educating taxpayers.

I ask folks, when I bring this up at a townhall, to look at it themselves. What does it do to your business? What does it do to you personally? How does it impact you? Educate, because there is no interest like self-interest. So look what it does for you, and it is a better way to get at it.

It has got all these advantages. All this investment would stay here in the United States. I have cosponsored it for 6 years.

One quick anecdote and I will shut up. I have not had a CPA come to me and complain about sponsoring the FairTax, that you are going to put us out of business. I did have the mother of a CPA come to me, and she was a diminutive little lady who thumped me on the chest really hard and said: Don't you put my daughter out of business. I said: Ma'am, I have got that. I have got that.

Well, it just so happens I am real good friends with the CPA daughter. I ran into her a couple weeks later. She said: Hey, I understand you saw my mom. I said: Yeah, she was worried about me putting you out of business. She said: Don't worry about my mom. If the Code went away, all that tax compliance work went away, we would find really good stuff that we could do for our clients to promote their business, help them be more efficient, help them grow and do all those kinds of things that we would really rather do than comply with an ever-changing Tax Code.

I appreciate my colleague sponsoring this hour tonight and those who are about to speak and have spoken, because it is important to educate the American taxpayer so that that groundswell of support—you know, the folks who support a national sales tax, the folks who support a flat tax, basically, are telling Congress, we want something other than the current Code. The problem is we have got to have enough oomph, enough political muscle from the electorate—I am not sure how she is going to spell that—to back it so they would represent that two-thirds to overcome a policy that is this invasive, this expansive, and make that happen.

So it is about educating taxpayers, getting them on board to create that political will that then gets communicated to the 435 of us who actually have the voting cards that can make it happen.

So I appreciate my colleague for sponsoring this tonight and allowing me to prattle on for a whole lot longer than you probably wanted, but thank you for letting me be with you tonight.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, your leadership has been invaluable on this, not just because of the people you represent, but because of your background as a CPA. The American people know instinctively there is a better way to do it, and to have it from someone who spent a lifetime in that space, we really can move on. I laughed at your story about getting thumped in the chest.

We have been joined by JODY HICE from the great State of Georgia. In our district, folks thump you in the chest and say, you better put your name on the FairTax. In fact, Congressman HICE has constituents out in the hallway right now but cared enough about the FairTax to come down just for a moment. I appreciate him doing that. I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. It is just a great honor anytime to be able to speak on the FairTax, and I just want to say thank you for your incredible leadership in keeping this ball moving forward. But, yes, you are right. In fact, one of the first things I did when I took office here was to cosponsor the FairTax.

If there is any one issue in the 10th District of Georgia that I hear more than anything else, it is support for the FairTax. I think it is because the people know, really, two key things. Number one, taxes are far too high, excessive, and burdensome, and the Tax Code is absolutely too complicated. I hear this over and over and over. Every year it gets more and more complicated and bigger and bigger and bigger. And so, you know, we are at a point that the Tax Code itself literally cries out for reform, and I don't know of any better way of dealing with this than the FairTax.

We talk about having an economic boom, the likes of which we have never seen before. It is all wrapped up in reforming the Tax Code in a manner that can be done here with the FairTax. And, you know, this is something that absolutely we need to do. It is going to strengthen individual freedom.

Just think of this. Individual freedom is wrapped up in economic freedom, and the more we confiscate through our current tax system, the less individual freedom we have. It is going to promote jobs, the likes of which we haven't seen before. It is going to eliminate the IRS. Who among us doesn't want to see that happen?

The IRS, as we watch it these days even targeting individuals, it is just insane to think of any government agency targeting citizens of this country, but particularly an agency like the IRS that literally has the power to destroy lives. It is just an incredibly important issue for us to address, and so I am a strong supporter of the FairTax, and thank you for your leadership on this.

I think, as we come to the close of this 114th Congress, we need to do all

we can to keep this on the forefront—tax reform and, in particular, the FairTax. We need to move this needle forward. To you and your predecessor, John Linder, you have carried this weight on your shoulders a long time, and I am deeply appreciative of this and for your leadership in this Special Order. Thank you for letting me participate in it. I am deeply appreciative.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman. He is a new, first-term Member here, and he is already leading on all of these issues, and I am grateful to him for that. He has got his ear to the pulse of what folks want back home, and what folks want is more freedom and more economic opportunity. I am so grateful to him.

If I can ask the chairman: Trained as a CPA as you are, what is the benefit of the Tax Code? Everybody in this Chamber, from the far left to the far right, every Republican, every Democrat, everybody wants a better job environment. They want growth in the economy. They want the American people to succeed and be prosperous. What is in it for America to keep what we have today?

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, a couple things. Obviously, there is an industry created to help comply with a really complex Code. There is a smaller but, nevertheless, powerful industry that is in place to promote new changes and additional issues to add to the Code to make it more complicated. Every one of those special programs in the Code—deductions or credits—has an advocacy group. Somebody somewhere is using that piece in their tax return.

Here is an example. I was talking back home about the advantages of eliminating—A Better Way has got another tax program. But I said, making a comment, we are going to eliminate all those deductions and credits for individuals. I said, now, that is going to take political will because every one of them has an advocate, a taxpayer, not a lobbyist or all those kinds of bad words, but a taxpayer; and in order to overcome it, we are all going to have to give up our little special niches to make that happen.

No sooner was that out of my mouth and I finished it than a guy came up to me and said, hey, I agree with doing away with all those tax credits and all those deductions, but leave in place section 1031. Well, 1031 is that like-kind exchange section where I can take income-producing property, sell it, defer the gain, invest it in another income-producing property, and just kind of daisy-chain that down the road. Well, he is a broker. He sells ranches and farms, so it was in his best interest personally to make that happen.

It is hard to make broad statements that it does good stuff, but every one of those provisions has somebody somewhere in America who is taking advantage of it.

Here is another thing that just happened, and this has really nothing much to do with this. I got two calls

today, one while I was sitting here waiting for this to start from a voice that said, “Hello,” very stern, this is so-and-so from the IRS, Internal Revenue Service, and you have an audit problem that you have not addressed. There is a big deal going on, and if you don’t call this number back right away, we will interpret that as you trying to run from us, and it will enhance the charges against you. A clear scam because the IRS doesn’t call you. But nevertheless, there is a scheme out there available that someone could use as a scam artist to frighten taxpayers because, to an uninitiated person, they would call that number back. I have no idea what it would do to your phone if you called it back.

There is something going on there that hasn’t happened, but here is what would never happen. You will never get a call that says you have not paid your sales taxes, and because you have not paid your sales taxes, we are coming to get you. No, sales taxes are collected at the point of sale, and there will be no collection agency. There will be no opportunity for a scam in that regard.

But back on who benefits. Obviously, there are a group of folks who do tax compliance, and much of that is offshored, quite frankly, and then the people who use those individual pieces. So part of this is to overcome that inertia to change.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I am glad you mentioned that scam. I am going to find the camera that is focused down here and tell folks, if you get a call from the IRS, it is not legitimate. Do not deal with somebody at the end of a 1-800 number who says there is an arrest warrant out for you. If you don’t have any other option, call your Congressman, and we will intervene for you in that space. It is hundreds of millions of dollars that have been scammed from American citizens, Mr. Chairman, through this scheme.

The scheme works for one reason and one reason only, and that is that the IRS really is that scary to the average American citizen, and we created it. It is our creation, and we are complicit in this scam. Please, it is happening to your parents, your grandparents. I get those calls, too. I am in constituents’ homes. The calls are coming in then, and not everyone knows it is a scam. Folks are so frightened by the IRS, they are paying these folks hundreds of millions of dollars today.

I appreciate you mentioning that.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman. Again, I appreciate him sponsoring this hour. I know you have a couple other Members who want to speak. Thank you for your generosity tonight.

Mr. WOODALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have got down here with us what I would say is a gentleman who is second to none in terms of FairTax support. He is STEVE KING, from the great State of Iowa. Even before I was elected to Congress, I could turn on C-

SPAN, and when folks wanted to talk about tax reform, I would see STEVE KING down here talking about a better way to do a Tax Code. I would hear him talking about, from his own personal experience, what it was like to be targeted by an agency like this and what it would mean, as a small-business owner himself, to be free of that burden and be able to go out and hire. I have always been grateful for his friendship since he has arrived, and I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding, but especially for his leadership here in the United States Congress, and especially on the FairTax. And that introduction, Mr. Speaker, it flashes back to me some of the things that I haven’t really spoken to recently and how far we haven’t come over the years that this became, obviously, the best thing that we could possibly do from a tax perspective in America—or anywhere in the world, for that matter.

I have often told the story, but I should say I used to tell this story often, and that is that I am running my little construction business that I started up in 1975, and we have completed 41 years in business. I was audited one too many years in a row by the IRS, and I had learned that—we didn’t have copy machines in those days, so if they could ask for data, I would have just said: Here, I will run all these copies. You can analyze them. I will go out and start a machine up and go to work, make a little money so I can pay my taxes.

What it really did was it shut me down. It shut me down because I had to sit there in my office and serve papers out to the auditor because I was the one who knew where the papers were, and they were in my filing cabinet. And I had learned in previous audits that I didn’t want to just say: Here is the filing cabinet. I am going to work. Let me know what the bill is when you are done.

It didn’t work out too well for me.

□ 1715

So, I sat there for 4 days, and I served papers to the IRS. I would say: I will give you a paper. You can look at it. You can take your notes. Do what you will. When you are done with that paper, hand it back to me and I will put it in the file, and then you ask for another record and I will give it to you.

We did that for 4 days. At the end of that period of time, we had an intense negotiation. It came down to a number. I remember it clearly. It doesn’t seem so big today as it did then, but it was big then, and it was wrong.

I paid the taxes that I owed and had done that with good intent as well. I complied with the law, and I had intent to comply with the law. But they seemed to have intent that they were going to justify the 4 days of being drug through—I thought I was drug through that, not them—but when it



was all done, I had to go to the bank to borrow the money to pay the IRS that I believe to this day I did not owe. If I had otherwise borrowed the money to hire a lawyer to defend myself against the IRS and the Federal Government, the odds of success were so infinitesimally small that I had to decide do I want to stand on principle or—if I stand on principle, I can sacrifice my company—or do I want to borrow the money and pay bondage to what was an unjust principle and try to keep my business alive? That is what I decided to do.

Those who know me for the time I have been here know how hard that is—for me, especially. I had to swallow as hard as I have ever had to swallow. But I went back out to work, and I fired up that old bulldozer and I climbed in the seat and the smoke went out the exhaust stack and out of my ears. This is the way that a person has to do business in this country.

My oldest son owns that business today. He told me a narrative—not telling me the message I would get out of it—that he was joining up with an engineering firm to start a new business venture in addition to our construction work. They had a 90-minute meeting.

At the end of that meeting, David King said to the engineer: Mike, did you realize that we have just talked business for 90 minutes?

Yes, I surely do.

Do you know what our topic was for 90 minutes on this business venture?

Taxes.

Ninety minutes of human resources were burned up on how to set up a tax structure to start a new business rather than figuring how to produce a good or a service that has a marketable value here or abroad. That is what is wrong. It is the waste of human resources that are consumed in compliance with the IRS, and it is the waste of human resources that could be far better used in producing that good or service that has a marketable value here or abroad.

I have come not full circle on the issue. I stand exactly where I did in that time back in 1980 when I was audited one too many years in a row. But we are in the second generation of King Construction today, and I have to go back and look.

Just yesterday, I had a 1-hour meeting with a Commissioner of the IRS, Commissioner Koskinen, who is facing a privileged motion as well as a filed motion to face impeachment for malfeasance within the IRS; and the violations, I believe, happened directly under the watch of Lois Lerner.

So, I never imagined, Mr. Speaker, that day that I climbed in the seat of that old bulldozer and the smoke came out of the exhaust stack and my ears, and I began to think, I want to be rid of the IRS. I went through the process of, if you abolish the IRS, then what to do you do to replace the revenue? I spent weeks thinking that through.

There was nobody to talk to in those days.

I would go to, I called it my OshKosh B'Gosh caucus, the guys in the overalls at 6 a.m. in the morning, and I would sit down and I would tell them we need to have a national sales tax; we need to replace the IRS; we need to abolish the IRS. Give people their freedom. Let them make their choices on their taxes when they purchase, not have somebody looking over your shoulder second-guessing all the decisions you have to make while you are in business.

For weeks, we went through that, and they got a little tired of hearing me talk about going to—I didn't call it a FairTax; I didn't have a name for it except national sales tax. Finally, they said, well, if that were such a good idea, we would already have done it by now. Anybody that served much time in Congress knows that is a laugh. We have lots of good ideas that we don't do by now because there are competing interests here.

I have taken this policy to Alan Greenspan, the former chairman, shortly after he retired. I went to his Spartan office in downtown D.C., and I asked him if he would be the national spokesman for the FairTax. It was my mission to be a good salesman—and I am a good salesman; I have a good-looking wife, and that is proof positive—for the FairTax.

We went through the FairTax, and he said: Congressman, this is not an economic question. You are asking me, as an economist, to be your spokesman. It is not an economic question. You will not find serious economists that disagree the FairTax does these things that you say.

He said: It's a political question. So economists should not be selling a political question. Politicians should sell a political question. That is you. You go sell it.

I said: Well, let me try this on you. I want to go through this list of things that I say the FairTax does that is good, and I want you to interrupt me and challenge me at any point along the way of any component that I have said that can't be sustained in an economic argument, an economic forum.

So, I went through the list. I will just hit some of them, not all of them. The FairTax abolishes the tax on productivity. We are punishing productivity in America. People on that side of the aisle believe that consumption drives the economy. Well, if you don't produce, it doesn't. It is the production that drives the economy, especially when you are importing or exporting it, and we need to get that back.

It eliminates the tax on production. It eliminates corporate income tax, personal income tax, estate tax, capital gains tax. It allows for the repatriation of the U.S. capital that is stranded overseas by the trillions of dollars that would be reinvested in the U.S.

I went through this vast list of things the FairTax does that are good, and I stopped and I said: You are not inter-

rupting me, Mr. Chairman. He said: I don't need to do that, but you left something out. You didn't mention that the FairTax provides an incentive for savings and investment, and this economy desperately needs an incentive for savings and investment.

It wasn't that I left it out on purpose. I just forgot to say it.

So he said: Add that to what you are saying, and keep saying everything else.

And so I turned it into this. Now I just tell people the FairTax does everything good that anybody's tax policy does that is good. It does them all, and it does them all better. And that is pretty close to the final word on the topic.

Now, America needs to come to her senses, and if we want to have a stimulated economy, if we want to reverse this imbalance we have in trade and bring it back to where we have an export surplus instead of an import surplus, if we want to stabilize our currency, if we want to stimulate manufacturing and production in America, if you want to have a stable currency, a stable economy, an America that is a robust economy in the world again, we go to the FairTax.

That little island of Ireland that has attracted over 700 former U.S. companies that were domiciled in the U.S., now domiciled in Ireland with their little flat tax over there—it was zero for 10 years, became 10, then 13 percent or so. The dynamics that they have seen on that little island of Ireland, with the FairTax in America, would be multiplied by a factor that I hesitate to guess at here on the floor of the United States Congress. But it would be an awesome, dynamic change to our economy, and we wouldn't need to be importing millions of people from foreign countries to do these jobs Americans would do, because the wages would go up, the benefits would go up, our competitiveness would go up, and America would be back in the preeminent place in the world again.

That is how good this FairTax is. That is why I am here on the floor to support Mr. WOODALL, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and the opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. WOODALL. For folks who aren't following those numbers as closely as you are, yes, when this Tax Code was written in 1986, the average corporate income tax rate around the globe was almost 50 percent. Today, it is less than 25 percent. The rest of the world has been moving towards that tax competitiveness, while America has been standing still.

You asked about the good things that happen around here. Generally, the good things that happen are because folks come with individual experience, as you have come with; they come with passion, as you have come with.

What folks may not realize is here you are. The family runs King Construction, and you are not asking for a

tax cut. You are not asking for a tax carveout. You are not asking for a special favor or an exemption or a deduction. You are saying do away with all the special interests in the Tax Code, and let's just give everybody a fair shot at a flat and level code. It is that kind of selflessness that is going to drive the changes that have to happen here. Yes, there are special interests that are committed to selfish preservation of provisions in the Tax Code. I think selflessness is going to win out in that debate.

We are joined on the floor by a new Member from the great State of Georgia. His name is BUDDY CARTER. He represents the single fastest growing container port on the entire planet.

What I am saying to you is, when it comes to creating jobs in America, we have got to export to a billion new consumers in India and a billion new consumers in China, and we are not competitive with our Tax Code today.

The gentleman from Georgia sees this day in and day out, going out of the great Port of Savannah. In fact, I am told—the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong—out of your automobile exporting plant, we now export more Mercedes to the rest of the globe than any other vehicle out of that American port, because we are building Mercedes-Benz better and cheaper than the rest of the globe, and the rest of the world wants to buy them.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for holding this important debate on tax reform and the FairTax Act.

Tax reform is one of the most pressing issues facing our Nation today. In fact, it is so important that my very first act in Congress was to cosponsor this bill. I had promised that to my constituents. When I got here, that is exactly what I did. Without question, one of the most pressing issues that our citizenry has right now is tax reform. That is at the top of the list. So I am very proud to be able to participate in this.

You mentioned the ports. I am very blessed and very humble to be able to represent the First Congressional District in Georgia, which includes two major seaports: the Port of Savannah, which is the number two container port on the Eastern seaboard and number four in the Nation; and the Port of Brunswick, which is the number three roll-on, roll-off port in the country, meaning that we have cars down there that are leaving that port every day and going to all corners of the world.

It is something that we are very, very proud of, and something that adds to our economy. And it is not just the economy of the First Congressional District, but of the entire Southeast United States. That is how important it is. Again, that is why the FairTax is so very important to our country and why I support it so much.

We need a tax system that treats everyone equally, that encourages Ameri-

can businesses and the economy to grow and prosper. First of all, people don't like paying taxes. We understand that. We all understand the need to pay taxes. But if they are going to pay a tax, they want to pay a consumption tax. They don't want to pay a property tax. They would rather pay a consumption tax.

I have learned that after years of being a mayor and after years serving in the State legislature, that has been something that has been just very clear to me. And people want a tax system that is easy to understand. They don't like our current tax system that is so complex.

When you look at the IRS manual and you see how thick it is, it just boggles the mind to think that we can't come up with something much easier than that. That is why I compliment you on the FairTax, because it is simple and it is straightforward and it is fair, and that is what people want.

But even worse, we have got an out-of-control bureaucracy at the IRS that has completely lost the trust of the American people. When I go home, when I meet with my constituents time and time again, that is what they tell me, that they don't trust the IRS, that it is too complex. They want it to where they can file their taxes on a postcard. And there is no reason why we shouldn't have that and no reason why we shouldn't continue to work toward that common goal.

The FairTax Act would fully repeal our current tax system and replace it with a national sales tax on the use and our consumption of property or services in the U.S. By eliminating the Federal income tax, everyone can keep their entire paycheck and pay taxes only on what they consume. Again, a consumption tax.

No more struggling to understand the volumes and volumes of tax codes and exemptions. It would do away with all that. Simplify, simplify, simplify. Everyone would contribute their fair share based on what they purchase.

We all have to purchase. That is what makes our economy run, and that is why this is such an ideal tax and such an ideal system for me and for us as Americans.

You know, as a former small-business owner, I am fully aware of how difficult it is to be successful and grow when the tax system is so complicated and burdensome. I fought those battles. The uncertainty alone makes it very hard to take on the challenges and risk of building capital and hiring employees. The economy cannot grow if business owners are held back from making the changes and additions that they need to expand. We have to have that.

I believe that a simple and straightforward system like the FairTax will provide the certainty that businesses need to grow with confidence. Our Nation is still in an economic recovery mode, and business owners and families need all the confidence that they can get.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia for introducing this legislation and compliment him on the excellent job that he is doing. I encourage all my colleagues to support the FairTax so that we can finally have the fair and simple tax system that Americans deserve.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for making the FairTax number one out of the gate. I know he leads a passionate constituency.

I listened to you talk about what the FairTax would do, and I am thinking that is almost unbelievable that there is that much out there on the table we could seize for the American economy and American families that we haven't done.

□ 1730

I am reminded that America is the only country in the OECD, the only economically developed First World country that does not have a consumption tax today. Folks around America are accustomed to all of the downsides of our current system that you went through. There is a better way and the rest of the world has found it and we are lagging behind.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership to help get us there.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. WOODALL. We also have on the floor the chairman of the House Budget Committee. Now, I will tell you that if there is someone who is working harder for the American economy than Dr. TOM PRICE, chairman of the Budget Committee, I don't know who it is. And he is absolutely trying to cut every penny of waste, fraud, and abuse there is in the budget, but I don't know that we can cut our way into prosperity. I think we are going to have to grow our way into prosperity, and this burdensome Tax Code seems to be standing between us and that kind of success.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and let me add my voice to the echo and chorus of those who are commending him for his work on the FairTax. This is incredibly important.

And the gentleman is right. I have the privilege of chairing the Budget Committee, which is sometimes a blessing, sometimes a curse. But you put your finger on the thing that I want to talk about today because the FairTax, as you well know, our current tax system is punishing all the things that we say that we want.

So we want hard work, we want success, we want entrepreneurship, we want savings, we want investment, we want all those things that people talk about that.

They say: Why are we not getting those things that allow for that growth that has to happen?

And one of the reasons, I believe—and I know you do, too—is because our current tax system punishes each and

every one them. Every one of those things that we say we want, our tax system punishes.

So people make their equation and they say: Well, should I do this? Well, no. I am taxed more if I do that. I am taxed more if I work hard. I am taxed more if I succeed. I am taxed more if I hire more people, on and on and on.

So when you look at where we are, from a growth standpoint, which is incredibly important because we can't tax our way out of the challenge that we have got. We can't even cut spending to the degree that we need to to get out of the challenge that we have from a fiscal standpoint.

We need to grow the economy. And the growth rate that we have had over the last 40 to 50 years in this Nation, average growth rate has been about 3.2 percent. Your constituents and my constituents and people all across this great country know that over the past 6 months we have seen a growth rate of 1 percent, and over the past 8 years we have seen a growth rate in the neighborhood of 2 percent. So we have had a 33 to 65 percent reduction in the level of growth in this country.

What does that mean to folks back home?

It means the jobs aren't being created. It means that there is part-time work instead of full-time work. It means that you have a son or a daughter that graduates from college and they can't find a job in the endeavor that they have chosen. All these things that make it so that the economy is tamped down, harmed by our current system.

So the FairTax does all sorts of wonderful things, but one of the things that it does that would just reinvigorate and enlighten this economy is to incentivize the things that we say that we want: incentivizing savings, incentivize investment, incentivize hard work, incentivize entrepreneurship, incentivize risk-taking. Incentivize individuals who are out there trying to build a better mouse trap and we are going to reward them for trying to build that better mouse trap.

So I am enthusiastic about H.R. 25, enthusiastic about the support that you have continued to generate for this. I want to commend John Linder, who is a dear friend of yours and mine, and the work that he did to begin this project. I know that we will ultimately get to this point of a FairTax, of a consumption tax, because it is the right thing to do and it is the only thing that we can do that actually solves many of the challenges that we have got. So let me commend you for what you are doing. God bless you. It is a wonderful, wonderful work. And if you keep at it and we keep at it, I know that the American people will ensure that they invigorate men and women in this Chamber so that they support this commonsense, logical, exciting solution to the challenges that we face from a fiscal standpoint.

Mr. WOODALL. If I could say to my friend, a lot of folks believe that this town is just about talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. Yet you, in your budget that you have prepared, moved out of the Budget Committee, put down in writing, black and white, put your name behind it for all the world to see, every cycle, that there is a better way and we can do better.

Folks are afraid to take a stand on issues. You have been unafraid to take a stand. We cannot get from here to there without that kind of leadership, and I am grateful to you for that.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Well, thank you, because this only happens when people get out there and say this is the solution. These are the kind of positive solutions that we can put forward, and if we were to adopt them, then it's "Katy, bar the door."

Thanks so much for your great work.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. And I would encourage folks, if you have any—if you want the black and white on this issue, go back to the Joint Tax Committee Tax Symposium. The Joint Tax Committee invited in everyone from the far-right economists to the far-left economists and said, Take a look at America's Tax Code and take a look at a consumption tax like the FairTax and tell me what it would do for the American economy, for families, for jobs.

Every single economist—not some, not most, every single economist—said a consumption tax, a move away from our current tax system will grow the American economy. Some said a little, some said a lot.

But we can do better. There is not a single Member of this Chamber who defends the current Tax Code as being the best we can do. It is not. The FairTax just may be the best we can do.

If you are not quite ready for the FairTax—and I hope you are; it is H.R. 25—let me refer to the Better Way agenda. The chairman mentioned it earlier. It is on the Speaker's Web site, [betterway.speaker.gov](http://betterway.speaker.gov). It is on [better.gop](http://better.gop) as well.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee laid out a fundamental change in the way we do taxes. It is the most consumption tax-based plan a Ways and Means chairman has ever produced for this institution. It is not the FairTax, but dadgummit, it is moving us in the right direction.

If you want some encouragement about what is doable, about what we are able to bring ourselves together around, about what can really, Mr. Speaker, make a difference for jobs and the economy, look at what Chairman KEVIN BRADY from Texas has done. Again, it is a part of the House's Better Way agenda, but it is laid out there in black and white.

What my challenge is, not just for Members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but for all voters across the country is the chairman has laid out a plan that gets rid of the exemptions, the deductions, the carve-outs, all of the lob-

byist special favors. All of that is gone, but it is up to us to keep it gone. Take a look at it, believe in it, and then let's work together to make it a reality.

The only people who are disadvantaged by a change to a competitive Tax Code are our foreign competitors overseas. This isn't about Republicans. This isn't about Democrats. This is about America. This is about growth, and there absolutely is a better way.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their leadership and for joining me here.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## PORK SHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to talk about pork ships. Now, you may be scratching your head. What is a pork ship?

Well, a pork ship was a name coined by POLITICO. Some may think, well, maybe that is a creative barbecue dish. Or military historians might say: Well, maybe it has something to do with the Bay of Pigs. Others might think it is an Oscar Mayer-sponsored cruise liner. But all those guesses would be wrong.

The term actually applies to a chronically unreliable ship, the littoral combat ship.

Well, how unreliable is this ship?

In just the last 9 months, four of the six ships that we have built as Littoral combat ships have been in trouble. They have broken down.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been working to rein in this program for years. Unfortunately, the ship's manufacturers and some Members of Congress seem intent on throwing good money after bad.

The LCS has cost us almost \$20 billion so far; \$20 billion for six ships. But we have many more that we are going to build that are going to be flawed and that will break down. So the total cost of the ships over the course of the program is a mind-blowing \$120 billion. That is right, \$120 billion.

Now, we are scraping right now to find enough money for the defense budget. We are scraping right now to come up with \$2 billion to protect Americans from the Zika virus. Meanwhile, we are spending truckloads of money on ships that don't float.

Now, maybe I am being a little hyperbolic here, but I am going to follow through by talking about the history of the ship. The ship is so poorly conceived that even the name, littoral combat ship, doesn't fit.

The term "littoral" means that the ship should be able to operate along the shoreline. Yet, Navy officials have admitted that they haven't studied carefully enough whether the LCS is the right ship for warfare in shallow waters.

Combat. Combat isn't accurate either since the Defense Department's Testing Office has said the LCS is not survivable in combat settings.

Littoral combat ship. It doesn't meet the term "littoral." It doesn't meet the term "combat." And considering that one of these ships spent 58 percent of a 10-month deployment idle in a port, we might suggest that maybe it is not even a ship.

The Navy now wants to call it something else. Since this grand scheme that was concocted back in the 1990s doesn't quite fit today, let's just rename it a frigate.

So what is a frigate?

A frigate is a heavy, slow, and survivable ship. The littoral combat ship meets the heavy because it is much heavier than it was supposed to be. It is much slower than it is supposed to be, but it is not survivable.

So the question then becomes: What are we doing? We are never going to get back the nearly \$20 million we have already appropriated on that vessel, but are we going to spend extraordinary sums of money on something that didn't meet the initial expectations and has proven over and over again that it is not working?

Let's talk about the evolution of the LCS and how we got to this point. One of the primary reasons for building the LCS was to increase the size of the Navy by building smaller and presumably cheaper vessels. However, there was never a consistent agreement on the LCS' mission.

Military correspondent David Axe has called the LCS "Frankenstein's warship" and questioned whether the LCS should be a heavily armored combat vessel, a mine clearer, a submarine hunter, a low-cost patroller.

How about a small, fast amphibious ship?

It was apparently meant to be all those things, yet we seem to have ended up with a ship that can do none of these things.

Since the Navy didn't conduct rigorous analysis on the ship until billions of dollars were already spent, they were building it without a strategic plan. As a result, the LCS program has changed its fundamental acquisition plan—now, get this—four times since 2005.

□ 1745

We now have a ship that is less survivable and less lethal than originally planned. The real threshold question is: Do we really want to put our sailors' lives at risk on a vulnerable ship? That should be the threshold question. If this ship is so plagued with flaws and is not survivable in combat, are we not putting our sailors at risk?

On top of the fact that the LCS is struggling to perform its intended missions, it is turning out to be the proverbial lemon. As detailed by a Politico article in July, the ship's maiden voyages have been marked by cracked hulls, engine failures, unexpected rust-

ing, software glitches, and weapons malfunctions.

So let's start with February 2011. Here we are. What happened there? In February 2011, the USS *Freedom* sprung a 6-inch crack in its hull that required several months' worth of repairs. All right, that is the USS *Freedom*.

Now we are in June 2011, just a few months later, and we find that the USS *Independence* has suffered severe corrosion and has been sidelined.

In December 2012, the Defense Department's director of operational test and evaluation released a report saying: "The LCS is not expected to be survivable . . . in a hostile combat environment." Now, this is the office within the Department of Defense within the Department that is charged with making sure our weapons are safe, effective, and accurate; and the testing office is saying: Do you know what? It is not survivable.

In July 2013, the USS *Freedom* was, once again, immobilized during a trial run. So it has got two strikes now. Also in July of 2013, the GAO urged Congress to restrict the purchase of new LCS until the Navy completed technical and design studies and figured out how much it will cost to fix the vessel's problems. These were very good suggestions. Now, we pay these departments to make these recommendations. But guess what. We just ignored it.

We move from July 2013 to December 2014. Secretary of Defense Hagel directed the Navy to study ways to improve the program. However, the Navy doubled down on its failed strategy and prioritized costs and schedule considerations over mission requirements.

In December 2015, the USS *Milwaukee*—yet another LCS—broke down and had to be towed 40 miles after a software malfunction. In the same month, Secretary of Defense Carter directed the Navy to cut the program which would save billions of dollars. Once again, Congress resisted these efforts.

Another LCS, the USS *Fort Worth*, in January 2016 was sidelined because its operators failed to follow proper maintenance procedures.

In June of this year, GAO recommended Congress not fund any LCS for 2017. So what did Congress do? In a strained budget, did we heed the GAO? No. No, we didn't. The NDAA authorized not one, not two, but three new ships—three new ships—adding \$1.5 billion to the budget. Now, this is after the GAO said: Do not authorize any more LCS this year. What did we do? We actually upped the department's request of two to three.

But there is more. In July of this year, the USS *Freedom*—oh, my God, the third time—yet again encountered more mechanical issues. How bad is it? This time its engine will need to be rebuilt or replaced. This is a \$400 million ship that has been in dock, paralyzed, and towed in three times already, and now we are being told we have to replace or rebuild the engine.

Then most recently, yet another—there are only six of them, mind you, and five of them have had problems. In August of this year, the USS *Coronado* broke down because of an engineering problem.

Despite all of these problems and all of these warnings, what do we do in Congress? We continue to throw money at this ship. Lemons may float in water, but this lemon of a ship evidently does not, and it is taking taxpayer money to the bottom of the ocean with it.

Even the Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, JOHN MCCAIN, has questioned the LCS program, demonstrating that this is not a partisan issue.

Members, we have a responsibility to take care of the taxpayers' dollars. It makes you wonder why certain House Members are so committed to not just sustaining, but boosting the LCS production. Aren't we supposed to be prudent with taxpayer money?

The answer may be looking at what the shipbuilders were doing in Washington from January to March of this year. During that time, these shipbuilders were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to lobby Congress. Do you know what? I bet we are all paying for that in the bottom line of that particular contract.

I experienced firsthand what that money can buy when I attempted to introduce an amendment to the FY 2017 Defense Appropriations bill that would have reduced the total ships purchased from three to two for this fiscal year.

Now, the Rules Committee apparently decided that my amendment was not germane to the bill. I mean, truly, that is right. An amendment on defense spending was deemed not relevant to a defense spending bill. This wasn't an absurd proposal either; it was in line with the President's budget request. It certainly wasn't a poison pill. That one ship represented only about 0.06 percent of the total defense budget.

In hindsight, I should have followed GAO's recommendation to not fund any LCS next year. I thought only going with two ships was a fair compromise. We won't know because we weren't even allowed to vote on it. That is what we do here. We avoid voting on controversial issues. But that is our job, and this is more than just controversial. This is spending taxpayer money and spending it poorly.

Even LCS shipbuilder Lockheed Martin must have been surprised that my amendment never reached the House floor. They had already sent out a letter urging a "no" vote on it. Now, as I mentioned, it never even got considered because it was held to be non-germane in a defense spending bill. But their arguments for voting against the amendment are about effective as a littoral combat ship is at a littoral combat, which is to say not very.

Lockheed said that if we reduced the LCS program, the Navy would be "unable to sustain fleet capability and

meet global requirements.” However, the Secretary of Defense said that cutting the LCS would actually improve our naval forces by allowing us to invest in more pressing needs.

Lockheed’s letter also said that we shouldn’t reduce the LCS program because “ship count is crucial for the Navy to meet its tactical missions.” Ship count may be an important measurement of capability, but we should not be spending billions of dollars just to reach an arbitrary ship number, especially if those ships aren’t survivable in combat or stall out on the open seas and have to be towed back to port. But that is what we are funding. We are funding flawed ship design, and we are funding flawed ships that are costing us a truckload of money.

Lockheed also maintains if we cut the program it would force the shipyards to shut down. But that is not even true. The GAO says both companies who work on the LCS variants already have enough work on the books to keep their shipyards running to the year 2021.

Fortunately, there is still an opportunity to salvage some savings from this shipbuilding program. The NDAA conference committee has been meeting to discuss provisions for the final bill. The Senate version supports Secretary Carter’s directive to reduce the number of LCS. As a member of the conference committee, I have argued for the adoption of this provision. Cutting the total number of ships will save billions of dollars of taxpayer money over the long run.

As wasteful and as unnecessary as this program has been, it is just the tip of the iceberg of Congress forcing the Defense Department to spend taxpayer money on weapons it does not want and only seem to benefit certain industries.

For example, the House NDAA bill redirects \$18 billion in critical funding for wartime operations towards programs the Defense Department did not request. As a result, the bill would only fund the Defense Department through next April, effectively sidestepping the Bipartisan Budget Act compromise signed onto by both Republicans and Democrats that we reached just last year and putting funding for combat operations at risk.

In any budget environment, this is not the way we should be doing business, but House Republicans think nothing of engaging in these wasteful and irresponsible budget shenanigans—and some Democrats, too.

Now, I am all for Congress revisiting budget caps and looking for waste and areas where spending and support should be increased. But I do not support cutting funding to crucial, existing programs to fund programs the military doesn’t even want.

Furthermore, should we be funding programs and should we be funding weapons that have not been fully tested, as the LCS is, that has already shown that it is flawed, that has already shown that five out of the six

ships that are afloat have had problems, and they are big problems?

Whom do we work for? Do we work for big business; or do we work for the American people? Throwing taxpayer money at failed programs solely for the benefit of industry is not how we should be operating.

I am going to stop here. I am joined by my colleague from Minnesota. He is one of the most outspoken people in this Congress on issues around fairness in budgeting, and I am grateful that he is here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SPEIER for yielding. I appreciate the gentlewoman being the leader on this issue, looking after the public dollar and looking after our national security making sure that we don’t waste any money but that we put our energy into making sure that we protect the American people at the most proper cost because a dollar that we waste is a dollar we cannot use to do anything else. So the gentlewoman’s advocacy here, I think, is absolutely important.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman for organizing this hour to highlight an area of incredible waste of funds, the littoral combat ship. The Operational Test and Evaluation office in the Pentagon said in January that the ship is not reliable.

□ 1800

The Pentagon wants to pay for only two of these ships in 2017, enough to preserve competition and to make sure that taxpayers get the best deal for their money. Yet some in Congress want to force the Pentagon to buy three ships. Key Members of the Congress have expressed their concerns about the ship.

Senators JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED do not believe that the littoral combat ship could defeat an enemy fleet “unless the enemy fleet consists of a small number of lightly armed boats at extremely short range.”

The GAO thinks the problems with the littoral combat ship are severe enough to merit a complete production pause. The GAO recommends that Congress not fund these ships in 2017. The last of the Navy’s survivability tests will not be completed until 2018, giving us the answers we need to guide future development.

The events of this week only reinforce the GAO’s recommendation. The Navy ordered all littoral combat ship crews to stand down and halt operations in order to review procedures and engineering standards. Every single sailor with an engineering role on the crew will need to be retrained. This is due to ongoing challenges. That ought to be enough for us to take notice.

Yet Congress is not listening to the facts. The House appropriated an extra \$348 million for this ship in 2017. \$348 million goes a long way to buying

other things that can promote national security, but also things that can help domestic security—things like housing, things like food, jobs, all these kinds of things that we have urgent needs to address. We haven’t taken up the Zika. We haven’t dealt with Flint. Many urgent needs.

This is not a worthwhile meritorious expenditure. Somebody is getting paid, and it is not right. The American people’s interest should be upheld first. That is \$348 million above what the President requested for a ship that is not even working.

There are better uses for the taxpayer’s money. Like I said, Zika. Let’s make sure that our veterans are stably housed and support mental health programs. How about universal child care for working families? There are so many urgent needs that the American people have. Or, if we stick to military needs, let’s support our troops overseas for an entire year, not just a few months.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for bringing to light this critical issue. She always is at the forefront when justice needs a champion. I want to urge Ms. SPEIER to keep up the fight. We are very proud of her and the work that she does. We will always be standing by her side.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for his comments. He hit the nail on the head. There are so many important resources, there are so many important services that we need to fund, and yet we don’t find the money for that. Meanwhile, we have six ships, five of which have had problems, flaws, and yet we will not only continue to fund those ships, continue to rehabilitate those ships, but they are going to add three more.

When will we finally get the message that there is something wrong with this ship? Let’s go back to the drawing board. Let’s do this the right way. Let’s not build more ships until we find out what is really wrong. This ship has not been fully tested yet.

Imagine if we put cars on the road that haven’t been fully tested and then were breaking down and they were being towed. Would we put up with that? Absolutely not. But we are putting up with it when it comes to the funding of these ships, and I think it is a travesty.

I would say the LCS program has to go. Not just the name, because we have already proven that it is not subject to littoral shorelines. It is not eligible for combat survivability, and there is a big question as to whether or not it is a ship at all since it has the potential, or the propensity, to sink or to break down.

Let’s trim the fat from this pork ship and finally sink it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## ZIKA VIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity tonight to come to the floor of the House together with a bipartisan group of legislators from the State of Florida to talk about the importance of urgent action on the Zika virus.

Perhaps no story has captivated the anxiety of the American people more than Zika has recently. Neither has a topic more angered the American people, angered people throughout Florida, because of the inability of a Congress and a President and a divided government to put policy ahead of politics and actually address what is a growing public health crisis.

Many issues that we face today—and the Founders intended this—are regional issues, from flooding, to health scares, to infrastructure issues. We have regional representation here in the House. Florida, in the continental United States, is ground zero for the impact of the Zika virus.

What has emerged within the Florida delegation, I am proud to say, is consensus that continues to grow among Republicans and Democrats around urgency. Now, we all have different opinions about the packages that have been proposed. Over the past 6 months, we have seen three primary options:

The President proposed a plan of \$1.9 billion over 2 years. That was his initial proposal.

The House proposal had money flowing at about that same rate by reallocating \$600 million from unspent Ebola money that was to be delivered over about 6 months, so \$100 million a month, depending on how you calculate the color of money.

The Senate reached a compromised plan at about \$1.1 billion. Now, I am sure we all have differences of opinions about which plan is best. We have seen that. We have seen demands for votes on the President's plan. In fact, in the Appropriations Committee, we have had to take those votes many times. We have seen the Senate act on their plan. We have seen the House act on theirs.

I had great reservations about some of the elements of the President's plan, and I was honest about this. The President's plan assumed a 2-year crisis instead of just 1. I had questions about that. The President's plan allowed for construction of capital properties on leased lands with no recapture provisions. I had concerns about that in terms of stewardship of taxpayer dollars. The President's plan also expands Medicaid services of taxpayer supported health care in Puerto Rico by an additional 10 percent for any healthcare needs, not just Zika, arguably diluting money going to Zika. Those were my concerns. The system is set up for us to have that debate. It is okay that we have that debate.

Others have great concerns about the House bill and some of the provisions and riders in the House bill. They have objected to those. That is understandable as well.

In the Senate, they reached a compromise around a \$1.1 billion clean bill.

We should have these debates early on. Nothing should be rubber-stamped. We wouldn't be doing our job if we didn't actually read the legislation, see what is in it, and talk about a contest of ideas. But we can never let those differences lead us to inaction. That is what is at risk in the current Zika debate. We cannot let our differences lead us to doing nothing.

I believe we have a pathway forward around a consensus, clean \$1.1 billion package we have seen in the Senate today with my colleague, CURT CLAWSON, from the State of Florida and others. We have introduced the clean version with no riders of the Senate plan here in the House of Representatives to hopefully give us a platform where we can build consensus around it. I believe that is the way to do it. Drop the riders, fund Zika. Let's do it. Let's do it now.

But at the end of the day, whatever package comes through here, we are called to support it. This is a public health crisis that we must address, which is why, despite my objections initially to the President's plan, I have begun to vote for the President's plan in the Appropriations Committee because the urgency is now, and it is time that we pass a Zika package.

The American people are angry, but they are scared. It is not our job to take the nuances of legislation, the nuances of different colors of money in the Federal budget process, and try to preach at the American people why one side is right or the other. Our job is to listen to the anxiety of the American people and address a pending health concern in a divided government.

The anger is that this issue perfectly reflects the dysfunction we often see in Congress, and it is doing so in the context of a public health crisis. We have to seize upon the better angels in this Chamber and in this town. You see, it doesn't help when either side plays politics with the Zika issue when the first thing that happens after a vote is the two campaign committees rush emails out the door in Members' home districts trying to raise money or blame politics, blame each other.

As a Florida delegation, let us lead tonight in trying to form consensus around a solution on Zika.

In that light, I am happy to be joined this evening, first, by a colleague of mine from south Florida and the Keys, one of the most beautiful districts next to Pinellas County, I would say.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO), a champion and early endorser of Zika funding.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), my distinguished

colleague, for leading this very important discussion here this evening on a topic that has a lot of people worried back home.

I remind people that, in the State of Florida, this is, obviously, a public health crisis. There are a lot of women who are pregnant and are very concerned. A few weeks ago, we got a call from my wife's OB/GYN telling us that his office was full of patients asking questions—a lot of anxiety, a lot of nervous people in our State.

In Florida, this is also an economic issue. I met recently with businessowners in the Wynwood-Allapattah area near downtown Miami. They tell me that business in that area is down 60 percent. That means jobs. That means people who aren't going to be able to take income home to their families, income that they need.

For us, of course, it is a public health crisis, and that is our number one concern because we want to make sure that people can live comfortably and feel safe in our State. We actually know a few people who have left the State because they are pregnant and they don't want to risk exposing their unborn babies to the effects, the devastating effects, that we have seen Zika cause throughout the world, primarily microcephaly, babies born with brain disorders.

By the way, we are still learning a lot about the Zika virus. We don't know what the long-term effects are because, until recently, this isn't a virus that had really come under the microscope.

The bottom line is that we need these funds because we need long-term certainty in the fight against Zika. We need long-term certainty so that all the Federal agencies—the CDC, Health and Human Services, State agencies, local agencies—can all respond, develop a vaccine, and, of course, help partner nations overseas.

In Florida, we get tourists from all over the world, but especially from Latin America, from South America. We need to help nations like Brazil get this virus under control; otherwise, we will continue to be exposed.

Madam Speaker, I am so thankful to my colleague, Mr. JOLLY, for his leadership on this issue, for bringing us together here tonight—Republicans and Democrats—asking for common sense, asking to make the American people proud of this Congress, to show that we can be competent, that we can solve people's problems, that we can help people feel safe and secure in their communities, especially throughout the State of Florida.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, my appreciation to Congressman CURBELO.

Carlos raises an interesting insight, which is part of getting to the bottom of this early on, that, as stewards of taxpayer dollars, what is the money to be used for? Those questions initially are very important. As I mentioned, I had some early objections with the President's plan that I have resigned



over that I will support if it is what it takes to get a package done. But what is the money used for? That is an important question for the American people.

One of the questions was: Is mosquito control really a Federal activity? That is a legitimate question. Should we rely on States and localities for mosquito control?

Here is the important thing you will learn when you get into why we need a Federal bill to support Zika. It is about the vaccine development. It is about the research into how do we have a cure and eradicate the Zika virus, how do we partner with States and localities who are deploying resources right now for mosquito control, mosquito abatement and education; but how does the Federal Government also step in in the midst of what is a public health crisis with national implications both to people's health, to their lives, and also to our Nation's economy and Florida's economy? What is the proper role of the Federal Government?

In this case, I believe it is to provide the funding, hopefully at the \$1.1 billion level, but I would be happy to support the \$1.9 billion as well, whatever it takes to get it done.

□ 1815

Representing the urgency and consensus to get this done, we are joined by a Democratic colleague of ours from Palm Beach and the Broward County area, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I thank my Republican colleagues for joining here on this vitally important issue.

I rise to call for a vote on a Zika funding bill that is free of partisan hot button issues and that is free of political gamesmanship.

I am proud to join in this call for action with my Florida colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike. We have come together—above partisan divisions—to support the administration's request for emergency Zika funding. Our ability to come together and the refusal of the rest of this Congress to do the same is telling. South Florida is actively fighting outbreaks in South Beach and Wynwood. There are cases in Broward County, and there are cases in Palm Beach County, and we have seen locally acquired cases in my home district.

My constituents and the constituents of my colleagues throughout Florida are feeling the anxiety and the fear that come when there is so much that is out of their control. It is time for Congress to do all that we can to help stop the spread of this virus. This Congress' inaction is hurting Florida's families. As Representative CURBELO pointed out, it is hurting our economy.

I have three children. My twin daughters are just settling back in to start a new year of college. Today, by the way—I share with my Florida colleagues—they are celebrating their 21st

birthday. My son is finishing up high school; but it feels like just yesterday when my wife and I were anxiously expecting each of their arrivals into our lives. Like most Americans who are starting a family or who are growing a family, we experienced the full range of complex emotions as we waited for their births: the sense of not knowing exactly what is going to come, the excitement, the anxiety, the anticipation, the joy. Unfortunately, the Zika virus is threatening the joy of growing a family for thousands of Floridians, and we are just not doing all that we can to stop it.

In December of last year, after outbreaks in Brazil were connected to devastating birth defects, The New York Times reported a warning for the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The CDC warned at the time that imported cases "will likely increase and may result in local spread of the virus in some areas of the United States."

Now, at that time in December, 2,700 babies had been born with microcephaly in Brazil—an increase from 150 the year before. These babies were born with abnormally small heads, and now we know, from subsequent research, that the Zika virus attacks growing cells that cause incomplete brain development and smaller heads in these children. These birth defects are devastating. They are also incurable. These children will have lifelong problems with their vision and with their cognitive abilities and will have other complications.

Now we know that the CDC's warning in December has become a reality in Puerto Rico and in south Florida.

Verified cases have exploded in Puerto Rico. In the span of only a few weeks—from the end of July until today—the total cases of Zika on the island have jumped from 5,500 total and 672 in pregnant women to nearly 14,000 total and 1,000 cases in pregnant women. If these trends continue, experts expect that a quarter of the population of Puerto Rico will be infected—or 887,000 infections. That, unfortunately, would represent tens of thousands of babies being born with microcephaly.

The costs of care and the toll on families is staggering. This is an issue that affects families. It is also an issue that winds up affecting their communities. The lifetime costs of medical care for each of these children will be in the millions of dollars.

While the virus is spreading rapidly in Puerto Rico, experts like virologist Tim Tellinghuisen of Scripps Research Institute said that the situation in Puerto Rico could very much happen in Florida. Over the past 7 weeks, as Congress was in recess, Florida cases went from 311—and no local infections—to over 600 cases, including 56 local infections. The number of cases in pregnant women has doubled. Our constituents are at risk.

For us, this is not a political fight. Honestly, in my heart, I do not under-

stand how this has become a political fight for those leaders who have blocked the Zika funding in a clean bill. I understand and my colleagues here understand that we serve in the most polarized Congress in history. There are all kinds of issues that we could debate and ways that we might get at that and ways that we could change it as we need to. We have seen the divide over and over again between Republicans in Congress and President Obama; but the funds requested in this Zika battle—the funds requested to fight Zika—are not grounded in ideology.

The President didn't wake up one day and say: Hmm, I think we should have \$1.9 billion to fund Zika.

After the warnings that followed the outbreaks in Brazil, President Obama went to the scientists and to the experts at the NIH and the CDC and other agencies, and he asked: What will it take to respond?

His request to this Congress represents their answer.

As we heard last week, the funding situation is now dire. Dr. Tom Frieden, the Director of the CDC, said, basically, we are out of money.

So I join my colleagues here because it is past time to act. We have to put these political battles behind us. We have to do—and we have the opportunity to do here—something that, I think, is not only the right thing for us and, more importantly, for our constituents—for the American people—but we could do something that would actually, perhaps, set an example. We should elevate the common good. We have to protect American families, and we have to pass a clean funding bill to stop the spread of Zika.

To Mr. JOLLY, I will relay just one conversation I had on my way out of the office. I was talking to a staffer of mine about the coming months, and the conversation turned to November, when there is an election. Sometimes people from D.C. like to volunteer on campaigns on the weekend before the election. I have a young woman in my office who said she just doesn't think that she is going to be willing to go down this year out of fear of Zika.

How do we not show that we can act in a way that responds to a public health emergency, and only to that public health emergency, without bringing in all of these other issues?

We have to do this. I am really grateful to be here on the House floor, and I am really thrilled to be here with my Republican colleagues, who are as committed to doing this as I am. I am so grateful for the opportunity to share this time with you.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague, Mr. DEUTCH.

That is the urgency. My colleague, Mr. DEUTCH, mentioned his family, and birthday wishes are in order.

Congratulations.

My wife and I just got married last year, and we are hoping to have a family ourselves. We live within 5 or 10

miles of one of the non-travel-related cases. Folks do understand the anxiety that creates for people in Florida who are hoping to have a family.

Yesterday and the day before—and it created a bit of a buzz—I brought about 100 mosquitoes of the *Aedes aegypti* variety, which are capable of carrying Zika. Through working with the University of South Florida, we were able to get these mosquitoes here to Washington, D.C., because I wanted colleagues to understand the urgency of what happens to families in Florida when they are in the proximity of these mosquitoes.

When I gave a speech with these mosquitoes, do you know what the American people said—hundreds and thousands of people?

“Release them.” “Smash the jar.”

Do you want to see Congress work fast?

Expose Zika mosquitoes in this Chamber. We would shut it down. We would scrub the Chamber. People would get tested. That is the anxiety. That is the urgency.

It doesn't know partisanship. It is okay that we have had this debate initially over what the right response is—the President's proposal, the House's, or the Senate's. That is okay. That is doing our job, but it is not doing our job when we let the fighting and debating lead us to do nothing.

We are joined tonight by another leader in our delegation from the panhandle—the Tallahassee area of Florida—a good friend, a Democratic friend, Ms. GWEN GRAHAM.

Ms. GRAHAM. I thank Congressman JOLLY, and I thank Congressman DEUTCH very much for arranging this tonight. It means a lot. I feel the same anxiety just being as close to the larvae as others feel, and I might just ask that the gentleman keeps them in the jar.

Madam Speaker, let me talk about my home State of Florida. I was born and raised in south Florida. I think, right around now, the Sun is probably setting in south Florida. The weather is nice. It is 80 degrees. The sky is that beautiful pink that we get. Vacationing tourists are strolling along the beach or are enjoying dinner on a patio. Somewhere—I know this—there is a dad outside who is grilling steaks, and moms are watching soccer practice. That is our life. That is our life in the beautiful State of Florida. It is like a lot of other places around this country except, right now in Florida, families are scared.

I have thought about the gentleman and Laura, and I understand that fear.

Families are scared because, as the Sun sets, the mosquitoes are coming out. For all of our lives we have lived with mosquitoes. It is part of our life in Florida, but now they are more than a nuisance. Now they are a deadly threat. We are scared because there is a deadly virus spreading. Parents are scared that, if their children are bitten, they could get terribly sick. Seniors

are scared that, if they catch the disease, they may not survive. Pregnant women are scared that they will wake up one morning with a mosquito bite and that it may cause the children inside them to be born with terrible birth defects.

My daughter would be appalled for me to say this, but she is 25. She doesn't live in Florida right now. I hope she will move back, but the risk of pregnancy right now would not be one that I would want her to take.

So this is the new normal in Florida. More than 600 people in Florida have been infected with the Zika virus. Almost 100 pregnant women in Florida have been infected.

We have been sounding the alarm for months, haven't we, Congressman JOLLY?

I have come on this floor to ask for funding to fight the disease. I led a letter with more than 120 Democrats that asked Speaker RYAN to have a vote on full funding to fight the disease. I did a workday with the local mosquito control team in Bay County, and I have asked my constituents in north Florida to do their part to fight off the spreading disease.

I ask again—particularly now, following Hermine, as we have had a lot of water in our area—to please go out and make sure that you dump any standing water.

I am really proud of all that we are doing as Floridians to try and stop the spread of Zika in Florida.

Florida State University is researching the virus and making important breakthroughs.

□ 1830

Local municipalities are spraying. Ordinary people, as I said, are dumping standing water out of their yard. We are doing our part in Florida. Now, it is time for Congress to act and do their part as well.

Madam Speaker, yesterday I joined a bipartisan letter with Florida Republicans and Democrats who are asking for one simple thing: Give us a vote on a clean bill that would fully fund the fight against Zika. Give us a vote on a clean bill that would fully fund the fight against Zika.

This is a public health emergency.

Just as important, let's give scientists the certainty they need to research and develop a vaccine for Zika, and this could take several years. Prematurely cutting off resources before the vaccine is ready could be just as dangerous as not providing enough money today.

I spoke with the scientists. As they develop vaccines, they go through different trial stages. Ethically, you can't start a vaccine study, ask people to participate, and then say: “Never mind. Our funding has dried up. You are not going to be able to continue.” That is not something that we could do.

Our delegation has shown that Republicans and Democrats have come to-

gether on this issue, and I believe that the entire Congress can as well.

There are Republicans and Democrats in States along the Gulf Coast—Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana—who will come together and support full funding because their constituents are at risk, too.

I am still holding out hope that Speaker RYAN will be able to support full funding to fight this deadly virus.

Time is running out. It is time to put partisanship aside and vote on full funding to fight this horrific disease, Zika. We must all come together to make sure that the resources are there for mosquito control and for vaccine production.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Ms. GRAHAM. We are down to 4 or 5 minutes. We have two more speakers remaining.

I yield to the gentleman from Pinellas County, Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I agree with Representative GRAHAM that we must fund this and we must fund a clean bill. Whatever it takes, Madam Speaker, we have to get this done as soon as possible.

I have been focused on the growing problem of Zika since March, when the Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on Zika preparedness, and we have been working together in a bipartisan fashion to get this done.

Zika is a unique problem that will only increase. As of the end of August, there were 2,686 cases of travel-associated Zika within the United States. These cases came from international travel where the individual acquired Zika abroad and discovered it when they returned to the United States.

There have also been 35 cases of locally acquired mosquito-borne Zika. As a matter of fact, we have a nontravel-related case in our county, Pinellas County.

There are 35 individuals who got Zika because a mosquito bit them within the United States. Because of this local transmission for the first time ever, we now have a CDC travel advisory about an area within the United States in the Miami area.

If you expand the incidences of Zika to include the territories, there would be 14,059 cases of locally acquired infections of Zika. Mr. Speaker, this is a large amount. We must act now. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has nearly 14,000 cases of locally acquired Zika. That number will only grow, unfortunately.

624 women within the United States had Zika while pregnant, and 971 women from the territories. We don't know the full impact that Zika will have on their infants. Already, CDC reports that 16 infants have been born with birth defects within the United States. I don't know how many more when we include the territories.

Zika can cause microcephaly, a birth defect where a baby's head is smaller than expected when compared to other

babies. Babies with microcephaly often have smaller brains that might not have developed properly.

People are really scared, Madam Speaker. We have to get this done in a bipartisan fashion.

Not all babies who have been exposed to Zika while in utero, have been born with visible birth defects.

However, we cannot say that they were born without any effect of Zika.

It is possible that they may have delayed development.

That's why I plan on introducing tomorrow, the Pregnant Women and Infants Zika Registry.

This bill will establish a CDC registry program for pregnant women and will track infants up to age five, so that researchers can get a better understanding of the impact of Zika.

This registry will collect information on pregnancy and infant outcomes following laboratory evidence of Zika virus infection during pregnancy.

The data collected will be used to update recommendations for clinical care, to plan for services for pregnant women and families affected by the Zika virus, and to improve prevention of Zika virus infection during pregnancy.

I invite all my fellow Floridians and fellow members to cosponsor this bill.

It's a responsible tool to increase our knowledge of Zika and help increase the quality and standard of care for patients.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, we are about out of time. We have one last speaker.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, hopefully I get an opportunity to speak and continue tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Jupiter, Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and my friend (Mr. JOLLY) for organizing this Special Order, for his leadership on this issue, and convening this important conversation on the need for immediate action to combat Zika.

It is clear to us in Florida that Zika is not a partisan issue. It is about protecting our families and our children. Yet, 7 months after the World Health Organization declared an international public health emergency over Zika and the administration submitted its request for \$1.9 billion in emergency funds to combat the virus, no bipartisan agreement has been reached to pass a bill providing the resources needed for this fight.

As the number of Zika cases continues to grow across the Nation, including more than 50 local trans-

missions in Florida alone, this prolonged congressional inaction is unacceptable. That is why over a dozen members of Florida's congressional delegation are calling on congressional leaders to take immediate action on a clean Zika funding bill.

I was proud to lead this bipartisan letter with Congressman JOLLY, and I want to thank those Representatives who have joined us.

Our hope is that the rest of Congress will work together like our delegation and treat this matter with the seriousness that it deserves, taking action needed to protect the American people and public health. That starts with ending the political posturing and dropping divisive, unrelated policy riders and immediately passing a clean funding bill to provide the resources necessary to fight Zika.

This is an emergency, not an opportunity to be exploited to score points against Planned Parenthood or to weaken the Affordable Care Act. Congress' delay has only made the problem worse and more expensive as babies tragically born with microcephaly will require a lifetime of care.

The need for emergency funding could not be more urgent given the CDC Director's recent statements that current Zika funding is nearly exhausted, so we must find the bipartisan cooperation. We must pass a clean bill and get this done immediately. The people of Florida deserve it.

This is even after the extraordinary move of reallocating over \$80 million from research on Ebola, HIV, cancer, diabetes, and other chronic conditions to prioritize Zika efforts.

Beyond the funding, we also need to make sure the scientists and researchers working on developing a Zika vaccine have the necessary tools to do just that.

For example, during a recent visit to Scripps Florida, a leading research facility in my Congressional district, I heard from their Zika research team about the need for location-specific blood samples for their ongoing work.

Additionally, we must make sure that states and local partners have the resources needed to implement and maintain world-leading mosquito control programs to prevent the spread of mosquito-borne diseases.

I am proud to have put forward the SMASH Act with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAWSON, who knows firsthand how important mosquito control districts are.

The SMASH Act will support our local mosquito control districts to help fight the spread of Zika.

Additionally, the bill provides grants to support the work of state and local health departments, our partners on the ground, for treating infectious diseases like Zika.

To further bolster prevention, detection, and treatment efforts, Governor Scott should expand Medicaid in Florida.

Up to one million Floridians could be newly covered if the governor would simply accept available federal dollars.

These dollars would go directly to strengthening our public health and responding to Zika.

This crisis requires collective action, with all levels of government working together on both

immediate and long-term solutions to combat this virus.

There are also a few simple steps Floridians can take to protect themselves.

To prevent bites and the spread of mosquitoes, this includes wearing bug spray and draining standing water.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that Zika can be sexually transmitted and the same safe sex practices that help prevent the spread of HIV will also prevent the spread of Zika.

Zika and mosquitoes don't care if you're a Democrat or Republican.

This is a serious health crisis that impacts all Americans.

It is great to see growing bipartisan support in Congress to do the right thing, putting political posturing aside to move forward a clean funding bill to combat this virus and keep families safe.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. JOLLY, and the rest of our delegation for showing the leadership needed to get this done and enlist Congress in the fight against Zika.

Mr. JOLLY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I intend to take up the topic of the commemoration of the life of Phyllis Schlafly.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days on which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order here this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, this sad news came to me this past weekend that the relatively long and extraordinarily productive and impactful life of Phyllis Schlafly had come to an end at the age of 92.

I got to know Phyllis throughout the political activism of the country among conservative politics. It goes back for me quite a ways now, too, I might add. But I didn't pay a lot of attention to what was going on in the early '70s when Phyllis Schlafly's eyes went on some of the transformative shifts that were taking place in America.

Phyllis was a pro-life activist before Roe v. Wade. She saw it coming. She knew what it meant. She became one of the strongest pro-life voices in all of America and, I would say, the most persistent, the most consistent, and the most relentless voice for the long-est period of time.

Phyllis was active on the public scene from at least as far back as 1952, all the way up until the last days of her life, which ended this past weekend. I would like to go through some of those milestones of Phyllis Schlafly's life, and then perhaps have some comments about those milestones along her life.

As I review some of that material, Madam Speaker, I look back on her impact, particularly in Republican politics. She was a campaign manager for a successful Republican candidate for Congress in St. Louis in 1946. It was for Claude Bakewell.

She served as an elected delegate to eight Republican National Conventions. I don't know that there has been a more consistent or persistent voice at our Republican National Conventions over more than a half a century than we have heard from Phyllis Schlafly.

She was an elected delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1956, 1964, 1968, 1984, 1992, 1996, 2004, and 2012. You might wonder what she was doing in those missing convention years of 1960, 1980, 2000, and 2008. Well, she was an elected alternate in those conventions. And I would suspect that her choice was similar to that of what I had made a time or two in the past as well—that I wanted to make sure that there were young people that had an opportunity to be a delegate and that young people had an opportunity to come up and be active in politics. Phyllis Schlafly had facilitated thousands of young people to come into active politics.

Phyllis attended the Republican National Convention in Cleveland this last July where it was the last time that I saw her as she came into the Republican reception, the Members reception upstairs. I had an opportunity to speak a few words with her and see that radiant smile on her face. She was dressed in just a very, very colorful and gracious dress and seated in a wheelchair. The brightness in her eyes told me there was a lot of spirit left in Phyllis Schlafly.

Phyllis has played an active role in every Republican National Convention since 1952. The earliest real impact—when people began to notice who Phyllis Schlafly was—was when she published on May 1, 1964, the book, “A Choice Not an Echo.” It was a small little book that gave us an understanding about how presidential candidates are selected. It was a description of some of the backroom deals that were made about the dynamics of the presidential process. She called it for 1964. She identified who the backroom supporters would be, how they would try to stop Barry Goldwater from being nominated.

The book, “A Choice Not an Echo,” holds up to this day. She wrote a supplement to it as well to bring it up to speed, and published that book sometime in the last year or two.

“A Choice Not an Echo” was an impactful book, and it was one that is

one of the foundational documents that identifies the basis of modern-day conservatism. Phyllis Schlafly was one of a very few original conservatives here in America. She has been one of about three voices that were still active in the public scene that go back to the era in the early '60s. For Phyllis, it goes back as far back as 1946, when she managed a congressional campaign.

Phyllis' life has been deeply engaged in this kind of activity. She was elected first vice president for the National Federation of Republican Women, 1960 to 1964. She was a candidate for Congress in 1952 and 1970, in two different districts.

Phyllis received numerous awards. She founded the Republican National Coalition for Life in 1990 with the specific mission of protecting the pro-life plank in the Republican platform, and no one has been more active and had more voice on the pro-life movement and more effective than Phyllis Schlafly throughout these years. Her voice on this public scene will sorely be missed.

She was a volunteer and a founder of Eagle Forum. The people that worked with and for Eagle Forum out across through the States came as volunteers. She also established offices in all of Illinois and here in Washington, D.C., and kept a voice and a presence here.

Phyllis Schlafly became a conscience for conservatives. As we are trying to clarify the meaning of the Constitution, understand our place in history, and stand up for those principles that matter, often the voice of Phyllis Schlafly was echoing in our ears here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 1845

She would gather the young Eagles to come here at least once a year, usually twice a year to hear from them and give a number of us an opportunity to speak to the young people and take questions, but the bright lights that she identified, that she brought into activism have made, I think, a dramatic difference across America as that conscience of conservatism has multiplied across hundreds and then thousands of young Eagles that I had an opportunity to meet with and exchange ideas with and listen to.

One of my stories about Phyllis Schlafly, I will start it first with this. When I arrived here in this Congress 14 years ago, one of the first days that I was here to walk out on this floor to vote, I walked back through the back of these Chambers, and one of the Members from Missouri, Todd Akin, came over to me and introduced himself. He said: I want to talk to you about Court stripping. And I said to him: You mean Article III, section 2 of the Constitution? And he said: Yes. How do you know that?

Well, the reason I had paid attention to that was because it was Phyllis Schlafly who had written about it. In my years that I had been working in

my construction office, all I ever really wanted to do was raise my family and run my construction business. I didn't really think about being involved and trying to be in the middle of public policy. I thought there were good, reliable people who would be here making those decisions.

But I would send off for what, at that time, were little articles that I would call—you had to sign up for them, and you had to send off a check, and they would send you the mailing of her Forum document. Phyllis was all over the newspapers. I can't count all the publications, but I know she has published at least 27 books.

I would read these articles that would show up in these publications. Maybe the headline caught me, but I would skip the author. I would read the story, I would read the article, and, boy, that is clarity of thought, utter clarity of thought. And then I would look up: Who wrote that? Phyllis Schlafly. Time after time after time. Before I really knew who Phyllis was, I was reading her material. She was impacting my thinking, and I am wondering: Who wrote this document? Phyllis Schlafly. Hundreds and thousands of documents, hundreds and thousands of analyses that she had done.

And not only that, she was not disciplined to stick to a particular topic. I was looking through some of these topics that Phyllis had written books on. Of the 27 books, she picked a few topics: family and feminism, her book on family and feminism, “The Power of the Positive Woman” and “Feminist Fantasies,” those things that won't come true.

Phyllis Schlafly, her comment on the judiciary, the book called, “The Supremacists: The Tyranny of Judges and How to Stop It.” I have it here. I have a story about that I might tell if we have time a little later.

On religion, her book, “No Higher Power: Obama's War on Religious Freedom”; her book on nuclear strategy, “Strike From Space” and “Kissinger on the Couch.” Then her book on education, “Child Abuse in the Classroom”; her book on child care, “Who Will Rock the Cradle?” and on phonics, “First Reader” and “Turbo Reader.” That is an example of the kind of work that Phyllis did.

She wasn't narrow at all in her scope. She understood her faith, her Christianity, her religion, her role as a mother of six, a grandmother, a great-grandmother. She understood her role as a wife; she understood her role as a student, as a law student with a law degree; and she understood her role here in America.

When the ERA came forward—and it was a mistake then, it would be a mistake now—Phyllis Schlafly, when they thought it was all done and the Equal Rights Amendment was going to be ratified—there were a few States left—Phyllis Schlafly started the battle to shut down the ERA; and it was almost

singlehanded for a long time, but she mobilized a nation and put an end to the Equal Rights Amendment, which would have ended up with drafting women into the military.

There is much going on today that she didn't agree with, but we have slowed down this train of liberalism. She has been a significant player in it.

I see that we have some Members who have arrived at the floor that I believe would like to add some words to this. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), if he is prepared to offer some words.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. KING. It is an honor to be able to talk about Phyllis Schlafly. Though I never personally met her, like many of the heroes of our country, all Americans benefit from the service that she rendered to our country, and in particular to the Republican Party. She is the person, perhaps more than anyone, who made sure that the Republican Party is the party of life, that really is out there to this day on the side of science showing when life begins and showing what is happening at every stage of life.

I am more optimistic than ever about what is happening to show this fact, but a voice there that just knew the truth and was unashamed in speaking for it, unashamed in helping our party coalesce around a core set of beliefs, and those core beliefs are the same ones that our Founders had. So when people look back and think that, you know, hey, the Founders were this era of giants, it is neat to have lived in an era when we have some of our own. Phyllis Schlafly was one of them.

She certainly set the stage for Ronald Reagan's speech, "A Time for Choosing," because of her activities in the 1964 campaign and because of "A Time for Choosing" and Reagan's success in that, success as Governor, and really shaping our modern party for the era that has been a conservative movement for a long time. That set the stage for Justice Scalia.

So an eventful year, a sad year to see her pass and Justice Scalia pass in the same year, but also, you know, an era when we can look forward to future success and an era when we can see what the true meaning of womanhood is all about. She was a champion for women in a way she may never get credit for.

So I am honored for her service to our country, for her defense of her faith and my faith, and for her contributions to make this the kind of country that really inspires so many around the world to see it as the land of opportunity. So thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his presentation here. I not only appreciate the kind words about the life of Phyllis Schlafly, but the voice of commitment to conservative cause that emerges as we listen to the gentleman's words from Ohio.

I would like to now, if I could, yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr.

WEBER), who has arrived. I would note also that our great friend Michele Bachmann from Minnesota is here on the floor of the House of Representatives tonight, and that adds a tremendous amount of joy to me to what otherwise is a sad occasion, but we have to be also celebrating the glorious life of Phyllis Schlafly. It helps commemorate it here to know that one of the people who was closest to Phyllis has made the trip here to be on the floor as we discuss her life and celebrate her life.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. KING, and I, too, want to echo that, for Congresswoman Michele Bachmann being here, what a treat. What an absolute treat. We miss her, by the way. We do miss her. I want to thank Michele for being here and all that she has done.

Madam Speaker, we did not recently lose a true conservative. We didn't recently lose the "first lady of the conservative movement." We didn't just lose someone who was a threat to the liberal agenda and a threat to Communists. No, no, no. Phyllis Schlafly was much more than that. You know, eagles are known, Madam Speaker, for their strength and their ability to soar high above the clouds. Eagles are known to be above the fray. Phyllis was our eagle. However, she was that eagle who, while in the fray, maintained that 30,000-foot view. And she was much more than that. She was a warrior. She was a leader. She embodied American patriotism and liberty.

In 1975, Mrs. Schlafly founded the Eagle Forum, which has been a pillar in the pro-family conservative movement for four decades and counting. There is no doubt, Madam Speaker, that the Eagle Forum will live on, and we will see her eagle soar higher and higher with time.

Mrs. Schlafly was the heart and soul of the conservative movement in the early days. Many people thought she wouldn't make a difference, but as we look back, Madam Speaker, history is telling us otherwise. You hear it over and over again that one person cannot make a difference. Well, I will tell you that Phyllis Schlafly was living proof that one person can make a difference. Phyllis soared the highest, cared the most, and fought the hardest—more than anyone else—for our conservative values.

Madam Speaker, since the day I was sworn in not quite 4 years ago, I have been saying it is time to put America first. Through all of Mrs. Schlafly's work, at the very core of her efforts, she wanted to ensure that our country was first and that Americans were our top priority and that the Federal Government and even State governments knew their place. I find great comfort, Madam Speaker, in knowing that in some small way, Lord willing, I might be allowed to take part in ensuring that the work of Phyllis Schlafly continues.

She was a passionate woman who loved this country, loved her family, and was fiercely, fiercely driven to ensure that our liberties were protected and that the unborn—the unborn—would have a fighting chance to the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Madam Speaker, those who know Phyllis know she always put family first, politics second. I can't help but believe that she knew that at the core of politics, it really was, really is, God first, family and country second, and political activism stemmed from that. Phyllis knew that.

By the way, she cared so much for this country, she came out early on in support of Donald Trump, knowing it would raise eyebrows. But that was Phyllis. You never doubted where she stood. You never doubted her convictions. Madam Speaker, she did all that for her family because she cared about future generations of Americans.

Above all, I appreciate her commitment to our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. We can take great heart in knowing that Phyllis joins her husband of 44 years, Fred, in the kingdom of Heaven with our Lord and Savior Jesus. Our hearts and prayers go out to her family. Mr. KING, you said 6 kids, 16 grandchildren—16 grandchildren.

Phyllis was an amazing person who lived an amazing life and did so much good for our country. For that, I will be forever grateful to her and the work she did for the conservative movement.

I want to thank you, my colleague, Mr. KING, for allowing me this opportunity to memorialize one of the greatest Americans. Madam Speaker, you know I am right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for coming down to help memorialize the life of Phyllis Schlafly.

Madam Speaker, the things that come to mind as I listened to Mr. WEBER talk about Phyllis Schlafly and I look across at Michele Bachmann, I think about a time that Phyllis took us back into a room in St. Louis to sit and talk to both of us about the future and the destiny of the country. It was three of us sitting there having a little snack and chatting away on the Constitution and the value of life and marriage and the current and the destiny of America. Phyllis always saw it, as I think somebody mentioned, from 30,000 feet.

The time I spend here in this Congress, the time I have the privilege of dealing with people at some of the highest levels in the country, the longer I am at this, the fewer people I am able to identify who can see with clarity the big picture and understand the currents of the course of history and the cultural movements that operate within this course of history that are actually driving it. Phyllis always saw it. She always saw it with a clarity, and that is what drove her to put 27 books out, and one of them was in support of Donald Trump.

She had time in the last years of her life, “The Conservative Case for Trump” that is published. I think of the work that she got done. If somebody said to me: “Well, Donald Trump is going to be the nominee”—and we maybe know this about the time of the Indiana primary—“why don’t you just go out and write a book and publish that?”—to pull that off and get that done, to do that when you are 92.

I recall the time when Phyllis broke her hip and she was in a hospital in St. Louis.

□ 1900

So, I thought, I need to talk to Phyllis. I just want to wish her well. I call her up and, yes, she is in a hospital bed all right, but already, first thing when she comes out from the anesthetic, she asked for her laptop. She is at the hospital bed with a laptop, no doubt writing, producing documents, printing things, moving public policy in America from the hospital bed.

On another occasion, I had the privilege to be named to present an award to Phyllis here in Washington, D.C. It was at an event at a hotel here in town. So, I am thinking: How do I make this work? Actually, my schedule wouldn’t work for that. I thought: I can’t let Phyllis down.

Then, I learned that Phyllis had hurt her back and she had gone in for back surgery. I said: I think I know how to do this. I will tape a video for the people that are there to commemorate Phyllis, and then I will go visit her in St. Louis on my way back to Iowa.

I flew to St. Louis and went to the nursing home where she was recovering from this back surgery. Her lap was covered with books and works and things we know. She sat there and told me how, yes, they had to put some cement in her back. I said: Just like it comes out of the truck? Well, pretty much, she said: They just go in there and fill in the gaps that I have, and now I have to take a little therapy and I will be fine.

Well, she was fine, mentally. This woman had an aura about her. There was a radiance about her. I can only name three people that I have laid eyes on in my lifetime that when they were in the room you knew it; and you knew there was something emanating from the character, the spirit, the soul, and the intellect of Phyllis Schlafly. It is extraordinary. It is an extraordinary life.

I know that one of her close friends was LOUIE GOHMERT, who is here tonight on the floor. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to say a few words about Phyllis.

Mr. GOHMERT. What a woman. What a person.

Phyllis Schlafly led efforts to return America to being the shining light on a hill that it had been, but the light was dimming. She would see that. She could see the harm that was happening to our most vulnerable, and she led an effort more years than anybody that I

have ever known personally to return America to being a citadel for freedom and for morality from which freedom can only grow. She saw us losing our way, yet she remained relentless.

Those who despised her know better than most anyone else this is someone who would never, ever give up. She was a leader, a warrior, a mentor, and a friend. Like very dear friends, like family, you have disagreements sometimes, but you know her heart. You knew she wanted what was best for you, for this country, for the world.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would interject; when I disagreed with Phyllis, I started with the assumption that I was probably wrong.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is a great assumption when it comes to Phyllis.

Well, she has fought the good fight, she has finished her course, and she has kept the faith. I will be there Saturday morning with her family, but the best memorial we can give to Phyllis Schlafly is to make sure the light of freedom and morality does not die in America.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for a very moving presentation here. I know that it means something very deeply in his heart, as it does in ours here on this floor and across this country by the thousands.

A couple of things that I want to just quickly inject into this discussion.

She would want me to say on article 3, section 2, Court stripping, we don’t need to genuflect to the supremacists. The Court has gotten out of control. The Constitution is set up to where they are to be the weakest of the three branches of government, not a superior supremacist branch of government.

Phyllis handed me the manuscript to this book, as I had a lot of long plane flights to do. The manuscript was just printed off a copy machine and kind of clipped together. I worked through all of that. I wrote my edits on it, my notes in the margins, red ink. I worked through it for hours—in fact, it was days. It got lost on the plane on the way back from Africa.

I went to her and said: Phyllis, I need a little more time to work on the edits of your book because the manuscript has been lost in the luggage. She looked at me and she said: Well, Congressman, I didn’t intend for you to edit my book. I just intended for you to have an early copy. I knew exactly what I wanted to say.

The book stands out. She knew exactly what she wanted to say. That is a lot about her intellect and her personality.

With utter clarity, the clearest political thinker of our time, based in Biblical values, values of Christians, constitutional values, a clear understanding of people and humanity and faith and family, she wrote on so many topics with utter clarity on topic, after topic, after topic.

She lived a life of 92 years and was a player in the public arena since imme-

diately post-World War II, and she is a player in our lives to this day. She is in our hearts, she is in our souls, she is in our conscience, and she affects our thinking and our actions—and she will for a long, long time to come.

This is a woman who has redirected the destiny of America. I can’t think of any woman who had more impact on the course of the history in the United States of America nor weighs more heavily on our sense of duty of what we need going forward to continue to honor the glorious life of Phyllis Schlafly.

Rest in peace, Phyllis. God love you. We do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 3:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of brother’s wedding.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 9, 2016, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

6692. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Viruses, Serums, Toxins, and Analogous Products; Packaging and Labeling [Docket No.: APHIS-2008-0008] (RIN: 0579-AD19) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6693. A letter from the Acting Director, PDRA Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s interim rule — Rural Broadband Access Loans and Loan Guarantees (RIN: 0572-AC34) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6694. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting an Update to the Report on Efficient Utilization of Department of Defense Real Property, pursuant to Public Law 113-66, Sec. 2814(a); (127 Stat. 1014); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6695. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Interpretive Rule Under the Military Lending Act



Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [Docket ID: DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-ZA11) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6696. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2015 report entitled "Preservation and Promotion of Minority Depository Institutions", pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 308 [as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)]; (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6697. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Athens-Clarke County, GA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8447] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6698. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Access to Data Obtained by Security-Based Swap Data Repositories [Release No.: 34-78716; File No.: S7-15-15] (RIN: 3235-AL74) received August 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) [Docket No.: 2015-ED-OCTAE-0003] (RIN: 1830-AA22) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6700. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — State Vocational Rehabilitation Services program; State Supported Employment Services program; Limitations on Use of Subminimum Wage [ED-2015-OSERS-0001] (RIN: 1820-AB70) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6701. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Programs and Activities Authorized by the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) [Docket No.: 2015-ED-OCTAE-0003] (RIN: 1830-AA22) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Savings Arrangements Established by States for Non-Governmental Employees (RIN: 1210-AB71) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6703. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Butanedioic acid, 2-methylene-, polymer with 1,3-butadiene, ethylbenzene and 2-hydroxyethyl-2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0201; FRL-9950-63] received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6704. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Citrus tristeza virus expressing spinach defensin proteins 2, 7, and 8; Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0034; FRL-9947-19] received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6705. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — 2014 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [MB Docket No.: 14-50]; 2010 Quadrennial Regulatory Review — Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [MB Docket No.: 09-182]; Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services [MB Docket No.: 07-294]; Rules and Policies Concerning Attribution of Joint Sales Agreements in Local Television Markets [MB Docket No.: 04-256] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6706. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 [CG Docket No.: 02-278] received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6707. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Compact Fluorescent Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2015-BT-TP-0014] (RIN: 1904-AC74) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering the period from April 11, 2016 to June 9, 2016 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 [as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)]; (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6709. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Chile, Transmittal No. 21-16, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act, and Executive Order 13637; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6710. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 160106014-6728-04] (RIN: 0694-AG82) received August 30, 2016, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6711. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces [FAC 2005-90; FAR Case 2014-025; Docket No.: 2014-0025, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM81) received August 23, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6712. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (128 Stat. 428) (H. Doc. No. 114-162); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6713. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting an order cancelling debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 386a; July 1, 1932, ch. 369 [as amended by Public Law 97-375, Sec. 208(a)(1)]; (96 Stat. 1824); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6714. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — BLM Internet-Based Auctions [16X.LLW0310000.L13100000.PP0000] (RIN: 1004-AE48) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6715. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XE707) received September 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6716. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Environmental Considerations Regulations [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0018] (RIN: 1660-AA87) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6717. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8838; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-18601; AD 2016-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6718. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8472; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-106-AD; Amendment 39-18603; AD 2016-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6719. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5594; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-169-AD; Amendment 39-18596; AD 2016-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6720. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31088; Amdt. No. 3706] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6721. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31086; Amdt. No. 3704] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6722. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5459; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-18597; AD 2016-15-06] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6723. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31085; Amdt. No. 3703] received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0466; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-18604; AD 2016-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5460; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-18599; AD 2016-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6726. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket

et No.: FAA-2015-8429; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-122-AD; Amendment 39-18608; AD 2016-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6727. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, PHMSA Office of Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: FAST Act Requirements for Flammable Liquids and Rail Tank Cars [Docket No.: PHMSA-2016-0011 (HM-251C)] (RIN: 2137-AF17) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6728. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3989; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-18600; AD 2016-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6729. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5465; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-041-AD; Amendment 39-18609; AD 2016-16-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6730. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Continental Motors, Inc. Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0002; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-42-AD; Amendment 39-18610; AD 2016-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6731. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Sta. Rita Hills Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0007; T.D. TTB-141; Ref. Notice No. 145] (RIN: 1513-AC10) received August 31, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6732. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel for Trade Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Enforcement and Compliance, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Correction to Applicability Date for Modification of Regulations Regarding Price Adjustments in Anti-dumping Duty Proceedings [Docket No.: 140929814-6136-02] (RIN: 0625-AB02) received August 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 5587. A bill to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; with an amendment (Rept. 114-728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 5226. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BLUM, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 5951. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MA-PD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 5952. A bill to improve the retirement security of American families by strengthening Social Security; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5953. A bill to forgive the indebtedness of the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 5954. A bill to prohibit use of body-gripping traps by personnel of the Department of the Interior and the Department of

Agriculture and on lands of such departments; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5955. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow the charitable distribution of traditional large and premium cigars to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. BUCSHON):

H.R. 5956. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to better address substance use and substance use disorders among young people; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 5957. A bill to include disabled veteran leave in the personnel management system of the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5958. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for Zika response and preparedness; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5959. A bill to require reporting of bullying to appropriate authorities and assist with equal protection claims against entities who fail to respond appropriately to bullying, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5960. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to make publicly available, through 2021, the amount of premium rate increases of health insurance plans in advance of such increases taking effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 5961. A bill to provide for relief of victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5962. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the automatic recertification of income for income-driven repayment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 5963. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5964. A bill to provide a Federal share for disaster assistance provided to the State of Louisiana in connection with flooding events occurring during 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 5965. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to disclose their concealed carry or open carry policies with respect to firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5966. A bill to convey certain locks and dams; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 5967. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to improve access to motor vehicle information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 5968. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 5969. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5970. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit sentencing judges in child sex trafficking cases to order the Attorney General to publicize the name and photograph of the convicted defendants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount excludable from gross income for dependent care assistance and dependent care flexible spending arrangements and to provide for a carryover of unused dependent care benefits in dependent care flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. DOLD, Ms. HAHN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5972. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide protection for students that report sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of certain life insurance contract transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 5974. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress regarding efforts to restore or repair Christian property in the Arab Republic of Egypt that was burned, damaged, or otherwise destroyed during the sectarian violence in August 2013, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 5975. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide mandatory minimum terms of imprisonment for certain trafficking offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 5976. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to support Department of Agriculture conservation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROKITA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing a commitment by Congress to never forget the service of aviation's first responders; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MARINO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 849. A resolution expressing condolences to the people of Italy and support for the Government of Italy in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake that struck the Lazio and Marche regions of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr.

KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 850. A resolution recognizing suicide as a public health problem and expressing support for designation of September as “National Suicide Prevention Month”; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 851. A resolution expressing profound concern about the ongoing political, economic, social and humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, urging the release of political prisoners, and calling for respect of constitutional and democratic processes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Res. 852. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the challenges posed to long-term stability in Lebanon by the conflict in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 853. A resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to initiate or intervene in a civil action regarding the compliance of the executive branch with the provision of law prohibiting relinquishment of the responsibility of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with respect to Internet domain name system functions; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 5951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 5954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.”

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 5958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 5960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: “To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 5964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 5965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 5966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 5967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 5970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution which states that Congress has the power “to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 5972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 5974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 5975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 5976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. BENISHEK and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 213: Mr. UPTON and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 407: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 546: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 605: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 662: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 756: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 793: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 846: Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 923: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 971: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1100: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1292: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1427: Mr. STEWART and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1457: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1459: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1519: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1600: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1618: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1686: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1779: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2096: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2124: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2132: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2156: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2218: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2290: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2296: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2348: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2368: Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KIND, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 2515: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2566: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2656: Mr. DOLD and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2680: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2694: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. LOEBBACH.

H.R. 2715: Mr. LOWENTHAL,

H.R. 2737: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. STEWART, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2739: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2793: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2799: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. Cárdenas, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2849: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 2875: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2889: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2902: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2948: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 2992: Mr. JONES and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3099: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HIMES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3117: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3216: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3261: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 3316: Mr. GRUJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3355: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 3381: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3438: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 3463: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3520: Mr. KEATING and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3523: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3538: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3546: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3666: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3690: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3720: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3742: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 3815: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 3841: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 3957: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 3991: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 4013: Mr. Cárdenas.

H.R. 4055: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4080: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4184: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 4216: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4272: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4275: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 4365: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 4520: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 4547: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4559: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 4625: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4626: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4657: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 4707: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4715: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4760: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 4764: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 4773: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4818: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4867: Mr. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 4880: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 5008: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5015: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5127: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 5143: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 5183: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5221: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5351: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 5369: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5373: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5410: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 5486: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 5499: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 5542: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 5583: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 5587: Mrs. ROBY and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5593: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5600: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5610: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5620: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 5650: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 5679: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5683: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 5720: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5735: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5756: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5785: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 5798: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 5877: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 5883: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 5894: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5931: Mr. POSEY, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 5935: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 5940: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 5941: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 5942: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KIND, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN

GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 5947: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 5949: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. BURGESS.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. BERA.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 360: Mr. PETERS.

H. Res. 586: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 617: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 625: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 717: Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 729: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 776: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DENT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr.

CARTER of Texas, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 845: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. LEE.

H. Res. 848: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. WEBER of Texas.